

THE LONDON QUARTERLY & HOLBORN REVIEW

Edited by J. Alan Kay, M.A., Ph.D. UNIVERSITY
OF MICHIGAN

JANUARY 1957

JAN 2 1957

Contributors Include

PERIODICAL
READING ROOM

THE WORLD METHODIST CONFERENCE, LAKE JUNALUSKA

ERIC BAKER, M.A., PH.D.

BASIL CLUTTERBUCK, M.A.

C. A. COULSON, M.A., PH.D., D.SC., F.R.S.

RUPERT E. DAVIES, M.A., B.D.

A. RAYMOND GEORGE, M.A., B.D.

T. E. JESSOP, M.A., LITT.D.

JAMES K. MATHEWS, A.B., S.T.B., D.D.

VICTOR MURRAY, M.A., B.LITT., B.D., S.T.D.

EDWARD ROGERS, M.A., B.D.

GORDON RUPP, M.A., D.D.

WILFRED WADE

FRANK BAKER, B.A., B.D., PH.D.

R. NEWTON FLEW, M.A., D.D.

FREDERIC VANSON



THE EPWORTH PRESS

[FRANK H. CUMBERS]

25-35 CITY ROAD LONDON EC1

Four Shillings Net

THE LONDON QUARTERLY AND HOLBORN REVIEW
is published on 25th March, June, September and December. All contributions (typewritten, if possible) should be sent to the Editor, 25-35, City Road, London, E.C.1, with stamped addressed envelope. **AP**

Contents

Editorial Comments by Alan Kay, M.A., PH.D.	1	Nuclear Knowledge and Christian Responsibility by C. A. Coulson, M.A., PH.D., D.S.C., F.R.S.	40
The World Church by Eric Baker, M.A., PH.D.	3	The Nature and Sphere of Christian Education by T. E. Jessop, M.A., LITT.D.	48
Methodism in Relation to the Protestant World by Gordon Rupp, M.A., D.D.	7	The Bible in Education by A. Victor Murray, M.A., B.LITT., B.D., S.T.D.	52
Problems of Church Union by Rupert E. Davies, M.A., B.D.	13	Dark Night and Radiant Day by Frederic Vanson	60
Our Unity in Christ by A. Raymond George, M.A., B.D.	18	James Hervey, Methodist Prose Poet by Frank Baker, B.A., B.D., PH.D.	62
The Way to Unity: Regional or Confessional? (I) by James K. Mathews, A.B., S.T.B., D.D.,	22	Recent Literature Edited by R. Newton Flew, M.A., D.D.	69
The Way to Unity: Regional or Confessional? (II) by Wilfred Wade	25	From My New Shelf by R. Newton Flew, M.A., D.D.	74
World Missionary Strategy by Basil Clutterbuck, M.A.	29	Our Contributors	<i>Inside Back Cover</i>
Christians and the Modern State by Edward Rogers, M.A., B.D.	35		

Artist without hands

(Fifth Edition)

A Memoir of John Buchanan
BY CECIL F. WALPOLE

This Book tells the story of a wonderful achievement in the face of difficulties and crippling handicaps. In John Buchanan, who was 'born without hands,' was found the blending of a courage and skill that have rarely been equalled.

Price
5/-
net

His delicate traceries, his amazing sense of colour, his perfection of lettering and originality of design, set a standard that has evoked world-wide admiration.

Many illustrations of his work are given in the present volume, and the story of his life with its striving, its disappointments, and triumphant successes, is vividly portrayed.

TWELVE ILLUSTRATIONS IN COLOUR

Obtainable from

**NATIONAL CHILDREN'S HOME, Highbury Park
LONDON, N.5**



Editorial Comments

THE WORLD METHODIST CONFERENCE AT LAKE JUNALUSKA

THE FIRST World Methodist Conference was held in 1881 at Wesley's Chapel, City Road. 'For several years', says William Redfern in *A New History of Methodism*, 'the desire had been growing that the representatives of the people called Methodists' throughout the world should meet together for consultation, and in 1878 the suggestion was made by the Methodist Episcopal Church of America. The moment was opportune. The Civil War was over, the relations between all the English-speaking races were perfectly cordial, the facilities for inter-communication were rapidly multiplying, and there were many questions, affecting all the Methodist churches throughout the world, which needed to be discussed.'

Since then, these World Conferences have been held every ten years, except for the one which should have been held in 1941 and was postponed because of the war until 1947, and the latest one at Junaluska, which follows only five years after that held in Oxford in 1951. They have inevitably changed with the years. In 1881, twenty-eight different branches of the Methodist Church were represented from twenty different parts of the world; though there was no African present who had been born in Africa and was then living there, nor was there any native Asiatic, American Indian, or Polynesian. In 1956 there were over 1,200 representatives present from thirty-nine nations.

These World Conferences have had important results. Wesley taught that Methodists all over the world were one people, and he bade them to cultivate their unity. In 1790, when he wrote to Thomas Morrell, one of the American preachers, about the progress of the gospel in America and the revolutions in Europe, he concluded his letter by saying: 'Meanwhile, it is expedient that Methodists in every part of the globe should be united together as closely as possible. That we may all be one is the prayer of Your affectionate friend and brother, J. Wesley.' Unity among Methodists is something which the World Conferences have done a great deal to foster.

They have often discussed and helped forward actual Methodist Unions. The first Conference was followed by the formation of one undivided Methodist Church in Canada, the second helped in no small degree to accomplish union in Australia, the third was one of the factors which led to the coming into existence of the United Methodist Church in Britain, and later Conferences prepared the way for other unions, including the British one of 1932. There is still more work of this kind waiting to be done, and it is as the representatives of different branches of the Methodist Church meet together that it will be seen to be desirable and be made possible.

But there are other values of these World Conferences which are equally great, though less easy either to define or assess. Although it is true that Methodists are one people, their outlook is very far from being uniform, and each branch of Methodism has its own characteristics, its own strong and weak points. It is important that the different parts of the family should

share their treasures, so that each may learn from all and all be enriched by the contributions of each.

Yet although Junaluska was a Conference of Methodists, it could not be concerned only with Methodism. Christian people cannot meet together today without having always at the back of their minds, and sometimes at the very front of them, the fact that they are members not merely of some particular denomination but of the whole company of Christ's people. So although the theme of the Conference was 'Methodism in the Contemporary World', the subjects discussed were those which are the concern of the whole Church. The four parts into which the theme was divided were these: (1) Affirmations (the Authority of the Bible, the Sufficiency of the Gospel, the Necessity of the Church); (2) Christian Responsibility in a Divided World (the Modern State, Race Relations, Missions, Nuclear Knowledge, the Scientific Age); (3) Christian Responsibility in a Divided Church (various aspects of Church Unity, Christian Education, Social Issues, Family Life, Missionary Strategy); and (4) Distinctive Methodist Contributions (in Theology, the Equipment of the Ministry, Protestantism, Ethics, Hymnology). Thus the first three sections consisted of subjects which vitally affect Christians of all denominations, and even the fourth, which was about things distinctively Methodist, considered them as contributions which Methodism could make to that which was greater than itself.

Nearly the whole of our space is devoted this quarter to lectures and addresses which were given at the Junaluska Conference. The complete *Proceedings* will be published in due course by the Abingdon Press, and no doubt many of our readers will purchase that book when it appears. But a selection of some of the good things which it will contain will nevertheless be of interest to them while they are awaiting the complete record, and at the same time will bring some of the matters discussed at the Conference before others who would otherwise hear little about its work.

The selection we give is only a small one, and because of the lack of space we have had to omit a number of lectures which we should very much have liked to print. We have had to limit ourselves to contributions by members of the British delegation¹, we have not been able to include even all of those, and the ones we print have been reduced in length. We are greatly indebted to the Abingdon Press and to the Rev. Dr E. Benson Perkins, Secretary of the World Methodist Council, for their co-operation and encouragement; and we are especially grateful to the speakers, not only for allowing us to print their lectures, but for having been kind enough to undertake the ungrateful task of condensing them.

¹ There is one exception to this principle, but that is because we felt that, since the programme arranged for two contrasting addresses about The Way to Unity, it was only proper to print both, although only one of them was by a Briton.

THE WORLD CHURCH

MANY OF you will be familiar with the legend which tells how, when Jesus had finished His work on earth and was returning to His Father, He was met by the angel Gabriel, who inquired what plans He had made for the work He had begun to be carried on. 'I've left Peter', replied Jesus, 'and James and John and the other disciples.' 'But what if Peter and the others fail?' asked Gabriel. 'I've made no other arrangements', answered Jesus.

It's only a legend, of course, but it reminds us of a very remarkable fact. When the bodily presence of Jesus was withdrawn from men's sight Christianity had no creed, no writings of any kind, no buildings; all that was left on earth as a result of His life, teaching and death was a small group of men and women. If they had failed, that would have been the end of it. But they didn't fail. Of that we need no clearer evidence than the fact that after more than nineteen hundred years I'm speaking at this moment to all of you who from every quarter of the globe are assembled here for this World Methodist Conference.

It's a far cry from Galilee in the first century to Lake Junaluska in the twentieth. We represent one only of the many varied groups in the world which bear the name Christian and are descended from Peter and James and John. Moreover, ours is the youngest group of all. We only began just over two hundred years ago, which is a very short time if we're thinking of Churches. When we began, all the other recognized denominations were firmly established. Yet God so richly blessed John Wesley and his followers that after this relatively short period Methodism has compassed the globe and become one of the great world Churches.

In our conference we are rightly and of necessity concerned for the most part with world Methodism, but tonight we are to think of the world Church of Jesus Christ.

What a change has come over the ecclesiastical scene in the last fifty years. The first nineteen hundred years of Christian history were years of schism. I do not need to remind you of the details of the story. We are all aware of the great division between the Churches of the East and the West, of the Reformation, of the many smaller divisions whose name is legion, of the birth and growth of Methodism and the schisms we have known within our group. But what a transformation we have witnessed in the last fifty years. When we are intimately concerned with these matters, progress often seems woefully slow, but take a glance over the last half-century. Within our own Methodist family in this country, in Britain and elsewhere, there has been a drawing together. But we are by no means alone in this. Think of Canada; think of Scotland where the Presbyterians have sunk their differences and brought into being that great Church of Scotland; think of South India where a union has taken place of special significance because the Anglicans, who have their own special difficulties in these matters, have found it possible to play their part; think of North India, Ceylon, Pakistan, in each of which territories projects for union are at an advanced stage—and all in fifty years. When the first world Methodist Conference assembled in 1881 none of these plans had been initiated.

Side by side with these events has been the steadily developing ecumenical

movement. Most people date the real beginning of that from the Edinburgh Conference of 1910, less than fifty years ago. In spite of the interruption of two world wars, and one of the worst effects of war is its effect on the preaching of the Gospel, the movement progressed so rapidly that in 1948 the first assembly of the World Council of Churches took place in Amsterdam. The most significant of the pronouncements of those delegates, representing more than one hundred and fifty Protestant and Orthodox Communions, was that having come together they intended to stay together, and the second assembly was held at Evanston in 1954 and included every significant Christian denomination except the Roman Catholics and the Southern Baptists of the U.S.A. (Strange bed-fellows indeed! A case of extremes meeting.) The business of the ecumenical movement is not to promote Church Union. It may help to do that, as a by-product, but its function is to provide a perpetual field of encounter, using that word in its best sense, whereby Christian corporate thinking may be stimulated and Christian co-operative action carried on in the many realms (such as inter-Church aid and service to refugees) where such practical action to meet human need is urgently called for.

Where do we look if we would see a gleam of hope in the desperate situation of the world today? To Moscow? Assuredly not, we should all agree. But not to London or Washington either, nor to the United Nations. This is not said in disparagement of statesmen or economists, whose ingenuity and help is indeed essential. But they have not the answer to the dilemma of today. I bid you rather look to Amsterdam and Evanston. The World Council of Churches is a frail and tender plant. It has its share of growing pains, but there is hope there, because it is based upon reality. Surveying humanity today, the characteristic which is most distressingly apparent is mankind's diversity. Men are grouped together in opposing camps, nation against nation, class against class. At every point we are faced with conflicts of interest and motive. To resolve such conflicts seems completely beyond the power and ingenuity of statesmen. Such diversity, however, is not the last word. Deeper than mankind's diversity is its unity, a unity which might be all the richer because of the different elements of which it is composed. It is, however, only at the deepest level, the spiritual, that such unity is a fact. Its principle is not hidden or unknown. It has been made known and the Church exists to make it real. Men are one because God made them all and Jesus died for all. The hope for the world lies not so much in the conferences of statesmen who are concerned more with the relatively superficial issues of politics and economics but in the emergence of a World Church, which shall unite British and German, Chinese and Japanese, white and coloured, capitalist and socialist, in the family of the redeemed. In principle, this universality of Christendom was demonstrated among the first generation of Christians. While Christians were but a handful in a pagan world, they included Jew and Gentile, Greek and barbarian, slave and free, male and female. All the traditional barriers separating man from his brother man were broken down, and men were one in Christ Jesus. The racial barrier, the economic barrier, the most subtle division of all, that of sex, on which the whole social fabric rests, were all done away. This unity still awaits its full expression. But the World Church exists, as no other human institution exists, to give expression to that fundamental unity of mankind as children of God which underlies our diversity.

These last years have also witnessed a resurgence of the various confessional groups, such as our own. Some have been perturbed by this, regarding it as a threat to the World Church and true ecumenicity. I beg leave to differ. The World Council of Churches and the World Methodist Council are not contradictory; they are complementary. We have much to learn from our fellow-Christians, and some things to teach. If the Holy Spirit is indeed leading the scattered members of the Body of Christ into new and closer associations, those associations must be mutually enriching. I cannot think of anything worse than that the various Christian Communions should lop off their distinctive characteristics and become merged in a kind of amorphous mass. Part of the contribution which we Methodists have to make lies, I am convinced, in a field where we are not usually regarded as outstanding, namely theology. When I tell you that, as far as my recollection goes, in the very one-sided document on the main theme at Evanston there was no mention of the Holy Spirit, that is some indication of what our contribution might be. It crossed my mind at Evanston that if suddenly the assembly had been confronted by the question put by Paul to the Ephesian elders, 'Did ye receive the Holy Ghost when ye believed?', they would have no alternative but to make the same famous reply: 'We did not even know there was a Holy Ghost.' But I must not trespass on other speakers' ground. The point is that we have a contribution, and we must make it together as a World Methodist movement.

Let me conclude by reminding you of the ground of all our hope for the World Church. Have you ever tried to explain the reason for the quite astonishing power of survival which the Church seems to possess? Since the Church began nineteen hundred years ago, innumerable societies and institutions have been founded, have had their day, and ceased to be. Great and mighty empires have risen, flourished, and fallen.

*Crowns and thrones may perish,
Kingdoms rise and wane,
But the Church of Jesus
Constant will remain.*

This is not wishful thinking, but sober history. If the Church is the decrepit institution some would have us believe, how are we to account for this? The reason is not far to seek. The Church has not survived, and will not survive because of the excellence of the men and women who belong to her. That is not only true of you and me; it was equally true of the earliest Christians. We have only to read St Paul's letters to be sure of that. The infant communities in Galatia and at Corinth included some people as imperfect as we are. No, the reason why the Church has outlasted all other human institutions is that, primarily, the Church isn't a human institution at all, but a divine institution. The Church is part of the fact of Christ. Existing in time, her roots are in the eternal. What really constitutes the Church? One of the earliest and best definitions is that of St Ignatius, who said: 'Where Christ is, there is the Catholic Church.' The Church exists whenever and wherever men and women, faced by the challenge of God in Jesus Christ, offer to Him the devotion of their whole beings in response to His great love for them. In the nineteen hundred years that have elapsed since Jesus came, there have always been such men and women, and

so there has always been a Church. If the time ever comes—I don't for a moment believe it ever will—when there is nobody left who makes such allegiance, the Church will have ceased to be; and all the organizations and creeds in the world will not alter the fact.

*The Church's one foundation
Is Jesus Christ her Lord.*

There is the ultimate ground of our continued existence, let alone our unity. It is a sure ground. It will enable us to bridge not only the gulfs that seem so wide within the human family and within the Church herself. It bridges too the widest gulf of all, that between time and eternity. The World Church of Jesus Christ is militant on earth, triumphant in heaven. That is what we mean by 'the communion of saints'. In the Christian Church we are in fellowship not only with all our fellow Christians everywhere in the world but with the great company of those who, having completed their course on earth, are now a great cloud of witnesses, surrounding the track along which we continue our pilgrim way.

*One family we dwell in Him,
One Church, above, beneath,
Though now divided by the stream,
The narrow stream of death:
One army of the living God,
To His command we bow;
Part of His host have crossed the flood,
And part are crossing now.*

While we concern ourselves with the heritage and the tasks that confront us, let us give God adoring thanks that, not because we deserve it, but through His infinite mercy, we are members of the Church which is our Lord's Body, the fullness of Him which filleth all in all.

ERIC BAKER



THE
might
Of
Chur
prea
trees
throu
answ
Chur
But
is th
heav
the t
of a
He r
toili
him,
Pred
the l
purp
Divi
once
mon
and
in t
Ref

The
and
mat
been
F
Wh
Hol
mer
Epi
plic
Rev
the
are

METHODISM IN RELATION TO THE PROTESTANT WORLD

THE CATHOLICS of the sixteenth century had a great taunt which they threw at the Protestants: 'Where was your Church before Luther?' We might begin with the question: 'Where was our Church before Wesley?'

Of course we did not begin with John Wesley. It is true of us, as of the early Church, that when we were very young we were already very old. Every word preached, sung, believed by the first Methodists was older than the redwood trees of California, and like them had grown slowly through many centuries, through the life of the Old Israel, and of the Church which is the New. The answer of the Methodists is that of the first Protestants: 'We are the true, old Church.'

But the real answer to the question 'Where was your Church before Wesley?' is the answer given us by Dr Roberts. Where it was, where it is, is 'in the heavenly places in Christ Jesus'. That is why Luther turned from Popery to the theme of Christ's presence in His Church: 'Christ is in heaven in the Form of a Lord: and he needs no Vicar, for He himself sits and sees and is in charge. He needs a vicar only in the form of a servant, in which he walked on earth, toiling suffering and dying.' That is why Martin Bucer, and John Calvin after him, grounded his massive stress upon the visible Church in the doctrine of Predestination, that predestination in Christ as it is proclaimed in the Epistle to the Ephesians, setting the Church within the great majestic sweep of the divine purpose, the inexorable, unfathomable loving will of God. It is this 'now' of the Divine Presence, a now which embodies at once all the past and all the future, at once memorial and eschatological, and which assures the Church at every moment amid all its sin, its ignorance and folly, of the possibility of repentance and renewal, which is the spring of that creative ferment which has never failed in two thousand years, and of which the signs and wonders of the Protestant Reformation and the Evangelical Revival are impressive testimonies.

THE FIRST WORKS OF THE REFORMATION AND THE REVIVAL COMPARED

There is a real sense in which the Evangelical Revival is Protestantism repenting and returning to its first works. It was a mighty agent for the reform of Reformation itself, the carrying out of the dreams of the first Reformers which had been overlaid by the conflicts of the seventeenth century.

First among the great works were the men and women who made them. What counted were not in the first place ideas or documents, but men. The Holy Spirit can turn bad men into good men, good men into great men, great men into giants. Just as St Paul, St John, the authors of 1 Peter and of the Epistle to the Hebrews are not really accounted for by talking about the multiplication of religious geniuses, so the men who made the Reformation and Revival, remarkably few in relation to the scope of their achievement, show what the Holy Spirit can do with men, when with one talent or ten they put all they are into the hands of God and mean the dedication:

*Be they many or few,
My days are His due,
And they all are devoted to Him.*

There are those, not usually historians, who still speak of some preferable, alternative, peaceful Reformation 'along Erasmian lines' which the humanists might have achieved but for the drastic intervention of Luther, the kind of Reformation favoured by those noble Englishmen, St Thomas More, John Colet, St John Fisher. Yet these men had their chance; they had abundant opportunity to do great things: they had the ear of royalty; one was the most distinguished lawyer in England, one Dean of St Paul's, another Chancellor of the University of Cambridge. Yet their achievement was trivial in comparison with Ulrich Zwingli and William Tyndale, cut off in their forties, whose works still follow them. Or remember how in the autumn of 1523 there came to the great city of Strasbourg a poor man, friendless and unemployed—and yet within a few months Martin Bucer had become 'the soul of the churches of Strasbourg', the architect of a theological and liturgical achievement which has lasted four hundred years. So it was with Methodism. 'Two young men', said John Wesley, 'without a name, without friends, without either power or fortune, set out from college to oppose all the world, learned or unlearned—they attempted a reformation, not of opinions, but of men's tempers and lives.'

One way and another all the creative works of the Reformation and of the Revival in the eighteenth century were concerned to let the word go free, to bring it home to the hearts of men. It was, in the first place, a return to the Gospel of grace, the healing of the wounded conscience, the forgiveness of sins, the new life of Christian obedience, the glorious liberty of the children of God. Theologically as well as historically, Luther and Wesley meet in the Epistle to the Romans. And in the second place, it was the Word preached. Luther, Zwingli, Calvin, like Whitefield, and John and Charles Wesley, were great preachers.

It was biblical Preaching. Nobody can do justice to Luther who fails to reckon with the extent to which the whole Bible, and not some selected doctrines or favourite epistles, is the background of his thought. And Calvin's great commentaries on most books of the Old, and almost all those of the New Testament proclaim him the greatest biblical expositor of his age. Luther's Bible, the English Bible (as it emerged from the hands of Tyndale, Rogers, Coverdale), the Zurich Bible, were themselves evangelical vehicles. And we know how Wesley, like the Reformers, was concerned first to establish a true and accurate text and then to expound it.

The Bibles of the Reformation went to the common people in their own language. But they were the products of scholarship, of the teaching Church. The years 1523-9 saw an amazing concentration of biblical theology, as groups of scholars, in Wittenberg, Basel, Zurich and Strasbourg produced a great series of theological commentaries, on the basis of an exact philological interpretation of the text. Luther's lovely children's Catechism, from which to the end of his days he made his own simple prayers, has done more for Lutheranism than all its theological confessions. Calvin's *The Institutes of the Christian Religion* is one of the great normative documents of Christian history. Luther's and Melancthon's care for schools had practical effect beyond that even of the humanists, and great teachers like Oswald Myconius, and Jean Sturm in Strasbourg and Calvin in Geneva did not rest until they had established fine schools and academies of higher learning.

But nowhere are the creative works of the Reformation more evident than in the field of liturgy. Thomas Müntzer lives in history as a veritable fanatic. Yet thousands of visitors packed the little Saxon town of Allstedt in 1523-4 to hear for the first time, and to sing, the great medieval hymns which he had taken from the choir and given to the congregation in their own German, and to join in a Protestant eucharist, fully choral, of which he had written words and music of striking beauty and originality. The City of Strasbourg produced about thirty liturgies within ten years, many of them of wide and lasting influence, not least upon the forms of Calvin and the Reformed Churches. And then, the hymns. When Luther felt that hymns would be helpful, he wrote round to his friends almost comically, for many of them were very second-rate types, asking them please to compose some hymns. He himself was a superb hymn-writer and one of his hymns, the great *Ein' Feste Burg*, became itself an event in European history. Martin Bucer produced the most lovely of all Reformation hymn-books in 1541, and of him a modern Dutch scholar has said what might be said about early Methodism: 'For him the Church is built round the hymn.'

These are some of the great works of the Reformers and of the first Methodists. They represent an achievement so out of proportion to the human agents that John Wesley's words are the only fit description of it: 'What hath God wrought!' These things were done through the Word, by the Spirit. And Luther's doctrine of the Spirit shows us the source within the heart, and within the Church, of ever renewed newness of life: 'Yes', he cried, 'we can even make a new Decalogue, new ten commandments, as Paul did in all his letters, and Peter, and above all Christ in the Gospels. . . . and these new Decalogues will be clearer and more glorious than those of Moses as the face of Christ is clearer and more glorious than that of Moses.' Here is the clue to the creative boldness—the *παρηγορία*—of John Wesley.

*By Thine unerring Spirit led,
We shall not in the desert stray;
We shall not full direction need,
Nor miss our Providential way.*

WORLD CHURCH OR WORLD SECT?

Great numbers and world-wide extent do not save us from sectarianism, but a catholic spirit. One of the most romantic spots in Europe is the quay-side in Venice by St Mark's and the great Doge's palace, where the Orient stretches out a finger-tip to touch ancient Christendom. There stands a man with a telescope bearing a card: 'Look at the moon. 200 lire.' You peer into the thing, and before you have made up your mind whether what you see is really the moon or somebody's bald head, there is a click, and all is dark again. There is nothing so narrow as the wide view. 'Look up at the stars'—much better just stay where you are and just look around. 18,000,000 people and seventy-two nations might still be a world sect.

Some of the first means of grace in early Methodism have outlived their day; we no longer keep fasts and vigils in the old way. But there was one means of grace which Wesley instituted which this World Conference might make its business to revive: 'The thing which I was greatly afraid of', said Wesley,

was a narrowness of spirit, a party zeal, a being straitened in our bowels, that miserable bigotry which makes many so unready to believe that there is any work of God but among themselves. I thought it might be a help against this frequently to read... the accounts I received from time to time of the work which God is carrying on in the earth, both in our own time and in other countries, not among us alone, but among those of other opinions and denominations. For this I allotted one evening in every month: and I find no cause to repent this labour. It is generally a time of strong consolation to those who love God and all mankind for His sake: as well as the breaking down of the partition walls which either the craft of the devil or the folly of man has built up: and of encouraging every child of God to say (oh when shall it once be) 'Whosoever doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother and sister and mother'.

Not only in the World Council, but in our towns and congregations, it is for us to take the initiative, to make gestures of reconciliation, to initiate conversations with our separated brethren. 'I am not satisfied', said John Wesley, 'with "Be very civil to the Methodists, but have nothing to do with them." No: I desire to have a league, offensive and defensive with every soldier of Christ. We have not only one faith, one hope, one Lord, but are directly engaged in one warfare' (1763). We strengthen the bonds of World Methodism because we are not willing to leave the note of Confessional 'world-wideness' to the Bishop of Rome, because we need a Churchmanship which is lifted above the conditioning of any one culture or race or nation or class.

We need ecclesiastical statesmen who are not tied by any doctrinaire rigidities of mind. What God calls us to do in one nation is not necessarily His will for us in another. It must inevitably be that as the years pass, and reunions take place in many parts of the world, the character of World Methodism will be modified, and new bonds within a wider unity will replace old ties. That is the way of human life: sons and daughters leave home; and we say, 'Well, you have not lost a son, but gained a daughter', when we know that we have lost both a little, as they make their own homes. However good correspondents we may be, if we are Methodists and move about a bit, we cannot keep all our friendships in equal repair. So it may be with the Church. Dr Roberts has reminded us that in this great matter, the sharing of gifts is more important than any thought of sacrifice. And though there must be losses as well as gains, there will be new gifts of God to offset them. The liturgy of the Church of South India is a creative achievement more striking than any single one of the uniting Churches had produced for generations. Let us cherish the gifts God has given us, and reverence, but not idolize them. For the God who gave us the hymns of Charles Wesley will have new songs to give to coming generations, who will worship God in temples and tongues unknown at present on the face of the earth.

THE PRIESTHOOD OF UNBELIEVERS

There is a story much read in England in recent months, called 'Bach and the Heavenly Choir', the fantasy of a modern Pope, who is devoted to music and greatly desires to make Bach a saint, to have him canonized as St John Sebastian. So he calls in the Cardinals, but they are horrified at the thought of canonizing a heretic. He invites the Lutheran Bishops to consult with him, but they will not dream of handing over their Bach to the Papists. And then there comes to

Rome a choir of Atheists and Free Thinkers. They agree with the Pope; they see what warring confessional loyalties have hidden from the Christians. They know that Bach must be in heaven. There is more than cynicism here. There is a truth about the millions of men and women outside the Church in the Western world. There is a sense in which they are a shadow Church, holding truths to which Christians, by reason of their sin, have become insensitive and obtuse.

The Reformation and the Wars of Religion involve both Catholics and Protestants in an entail of sin and judgement. In the sixteenth century two traditions broke away from an inner relation to Christianity: a tradition of Truth, in science, letters and philosophy; and a tradition of social Justice. Through the modern age these lone traditions have persisted, often one-sided, anti-clerical, heretical; but to them the Church, by reason of its own sin, cannot return an unqualified 'No'. The future is with the Church or Churches who can meet them with reconciling power. Protestantism has always been more deeply imbedded in modern cultures, more sensitive to the new pressures of the human spirit. But let us not underestimate the task. Behind the inarticulate indifference of the masses to organized religion there is a thought-world more intricate than many of the great non-Christian religions. Protestants will err if they suppose that any revival of fundamentalist pietism can bring back the estranged millions, be they a thousand times as effective as Billy Graham; and indeed such movements may in the end only widen the gulf between the Church and the modern world, by insulating Christians still more in a backward-looking introverted religion which meets its intellectual problems by evading them. The European Protestant Churches 'under the Cross' have in our time deepened their insights by suffering and heroic witness, but they confess that they have hardly begun to touch the great problem. Perhaps the 'Worker Priests' of France have shown us how poignant is the task, and how unlikely it is that revival can come by words alone. Cardinal Suhard said:

When I go through the streets with their gloomy factories, or the brightly lighted streets of the suburbs of Paris, I find the sight of the crowds now elegant, now wretched, so heart-rending that it hurts me. I do not have to look for a theme for my meditation. It is the wall dividing the Churches from the masses: a wall that must at all costs be battered down in order to bring back to Christ the multitudes that have lost him.

Protestantism was born with the doctrine of the Priesthood of all Believers; it may die unless it discovers the Priesthood of Unbelievers, its solidarity with all men everywhere, and with the great High Priest who died with undistinguishing regard for all mankind and who ever liveth to make intercession for them.

Of all the Protestant traditions, none is so fitted by its origins as Methodism for such a task. Here is the very marrow of our original testimony: the theme of Universal Redemption, that optimism of Grace which will not capitulate to pessimism or despair, which turns naturally to the great Epistles to the Colossians and Ephesians, with their doctrine of unity—unity of Church and world, of nature and grace, within the saving purposes of God.

Revival will come, but let us not think as we are prone to do, in terms of the evangelism we have known in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. God had different ways of renewing his Church in the critical ages of the fifth, the ninth,

the thirteenth, the sixteenth centuries. So it may be in our time. The great first works of the Protestant Reformation and of the Evangelical Revival are coming to an end as confirming and converting agencies. It may be that if our gospel is to come home to the modern world there must come into being new forms of Christian speech and proclamation, new forms of worship, new institutions of piety and discipline, patterns of Christian existence as different from anything we have known as our own Church life differs from that of the Middle Ages. Who is sufficient for these things?

We are sure that God is sufficient for these things. It is not an open question whether He will speak to the condition of our age. What remains to be seen is whether He will do it with us, or despite us; through our poor, lisping, stammering tongues, or through other shepherds who are not of this fold, or it may be of any fold at all.

That was a great moment in English history, during the peasant revolt, when the desperate army of hungry rebels marched on London, and when at the critical moment the young King rode over to them, and put himself at their head and said: 'Fear not, follow me, I will be your leader.' In the midst of our world stands its King, the Shepherd King who laid down His life for the sheep, who had power to lay it down and to take it again, who gives us of His Spirit.

'It is not we', says Luther, 'who maintain the Church: nor was it given to our forefathers, nor will it be given to our children after us. He it was, is now and shall be who will do this thing: who says to us: "Lo I am with you always, even to the end of the world. Yes, He is the Proper Man, and there is none other, nor ever shall be."'

GORDON RUPP

PROBLEMS OF CHURCH UNION

I RECEIVED a shock the other day when I read, in the official history of the Ecumenical Movement, that the effect of the Methodist revival was to accentuate, rather than to heal, the divisions of the Church. But on reflection I had to admit that there was an uncomfortable amount of truth in the statement. Since the beginning of the present century, however, that process of division has been entirely reversed. Not only have we become vastly more united within our own ranks; we have eagerly joined in every movement designed to promote the unity of the Church at large.

What are the reasons and motives for such a change of direction? I believe that among the most important of these, perhaps the most important of all, is the irenical, ecumenical spirit of John Wesley himself, who was willing to give his hand to everyone whose heart was as his heart, that is, to everyone who was in Christ.

Very important also is our rediscovery of the doctrine of the Church. We now know that the Christianity of the New Testament is a *Church* Christianity, that there is no Christian in the New Testament who is not, by the very fact of belonging to Christ, incorporated into the Church of Christ, which is His Body. The New Testament knows nothing of an un-Churched Christian. And the Church of the New Testament is *one* Church. The very thought of a divided Church fills St Paul with the utmost horror and dismay; Christ can have only one Body, one Bride.

We are also greatly moved to unity by the needs of the world. I do not think that we need be ashamed to admit this incentive, so long as our primary motive is religious and theological. A divided world will not listen to a divided Church. Indeed, why should it? If we cannot compose our own differences, what reason is there to think that we can compose those of the world in general?

We are therefore much more disposed to Christian unity than our fathers were. We are not yet, however, quite clear or unanimous as to how much this involves. Some of us in Britain are reasonably content with the situation as we find it; there is very much more co-operation between the Churches, both locally and at higher levels, than there was. Let us develop and increase this co-operation, it is said, and get rid of the suspicion and ill-will that linger in some quarters, and that is all we need to work for. To aim at anything closer in the way of union would mean the sacrifice of principles and practices which Methodists hold dear. This view is deeply and conscientiously held by some in British Methodism. Others are as deeply convinced that co-operation is not enough. They hold that the inability of Christians to take together the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper constitutes an evil so great that we must make every possible effort, without doing despite to our conscience, to end it. They therefore believe that intercommunion is the next objective in Church relations, and that means in particular intercommunion with the Church of England. Those who hold this view are prepared to wait on the guidance of the Holy Spirit for the next step to be taken after intercommunion is achieved. But some of them are already sure that complete organic union—a union, of course, that does not mean uniformity or any sacrifice of principle—is the ultimate aim,

however long it may take to attain it. Others are inclined to think that intercommunion, and perhaps some kind of loose federal union between the Churches, is all that we ought to propose to ourselves.

It is no use blinking the fact that the obstacles in the path of progress are, in any case, immense. I shall speak almost entirely of the obstacles to intercommunion. If ever we came to think of organic union, these difficulties would be, of course, intensified, and additional ones would appear.

Right in the middle of the path stands the Anglican doctrine of Apostolic Succession. This doctrine is held in very different forms by different groups within the various Anglican Communions. Some affirm that the Church of Christ only exists where the succession of bishops and priests by the laying-on of hands in consecration and ordination has continued unbroken from the Apostles until the present day, that no one is a true minister of Christ's Church unless he has been ordained by a bishop in that succession, and that no one not thus ordained can celebrate a valid sacrament of Holy Communion. Others hold that the *wholeness* of the Church and the *fullness* of the ministry are only to be found where the succession is maintained—though they would not deny that the Methodist Church is within the Church of Christ or that our sacraments have spiritual reality, whatever that precisely means. Others again admit that there is a place for non-episcopal ministries sometimes in some parts of the Church, but claim that the *best* ordering of the Church is episcopal in the historic sense. These groups within the Anglican Churches are often more at odds with one another than some of them are with us. But it can be categorically stated that the Church of England would find it very difficult, and perhaps impossible, to enter into a relation of intercommunion with a Church which did not accept the Apostolic Succession in practice, whatever it might believe about it in theory.

Now *we* are ready to welcome Anglicans to the Lord's table without any preliminaries and to receive the Sacrament from Anglican ministers likewise. It is natural therefore for us to think that the difficulties are created by the Anglicans, not by us, and that it is in any case a matter not of faith, but of order, and therefore not vitally important. But for the Anglican this aspect of order is a matter of faith; and it is not open to him, as an Anglican, simply to give way on this. The Apostolic Succession is an integral part of his Christian conviction, however odd and mistaken this may seem to us to be. For us this is not a matter of faith, and we do not propose to make it a matter of faith; we find it impossible to believe that Apostolic Succession is either a pre-condition or a guarantee of a valid ministry of the Word and Sacraments. Should we then yield to the scruples of one who seems to us in this connexion to be a 'weaker brother', and accept the Apostolic Succession, so long as we make it perfectly clear that we have no theological views about it at all, but agree to it as the means of Christian unity, and as providing a good method of Church government?

The answer to this question may well be Yes—if the Church of England is prepared to accept us on these terms, which it may well not be. But if we do say Yes, there is a real danger that we should have our tongues in our cheeks as we accepted episcopacy and episcopal ordination; we should be inclined to think that the whole thing was really rather trivial, just a way of satisfying our Anglican

friends. They on the other hand would think it terribly important. Here, it seems to me, is a real spiritual difficulty. But I want to suggest a possible solution. Can we not come to think of the historic episcopate as a means of establishing a link with many parts of Christendom, far beyond the Anglican community, from which we are at present cut off? Can we not think of it, too, as something which makes us much more aware than we usually are of the continuity of the Christian Church and the work of the Holy Spirit through the ages? If we thought of it in these terms we should not be repudiating any of the million things that God has wrought among us. We should be adding something—a profound truth of which the Anglican doctrine of the Apostolic Succession is a mechanical and inadequate expression.

But there is something even more positive that we can say to our Anglican friends. They invite us to accept episcopacy into our system. Our answer is that we have it already, in the most important sense of the word. The New Testament has nothing to say about episcopacy as it has developed in the Church; it has a good deal to say about the care of the flock of God and the rule of the Church—something which may be called *episcopate*. We have this most richly in Methodism. It is exercised in Great Britain by the Conference, by the President as the representative of the Conference during his year of office, and by the Chairmen of Districts and the Superintendents of Circuits. We happen to think that this is the best way of exercising it. The Anglicans prefer to do it by selecting certain men as individual functionaries, or, as they would say, as personal successors of the Apostles. Can we not fruitfully discuss these two notions of *episcopate*, and perhaps even reconcile them in a more biblical conception of the office of Bishop than any Church has so far attained?

Episcopacy does not provide the only theological problem, though it provides the main one. The Anglican minister habitually thinks of himself as a priest. We reject the idea which we believe to be sometimes implied, that an ordained minister has a priesthood, a right to offer sacrifices on behalf of God's People, which is not possessed by the layman; we hold this to be in conflict with the priesthood of all believers. Nor are most of us altogether happy about the idea of offering sacrifice at all in the Eucharist or the Lord's Supper; it seems that the once-for-all sacrifice of Christ on the Cross is impugned. I do not myself believe that the sacramental views of modern Anglo-Catholics, still less those of central Churchmen, are irreconcilable with our own—I do not think that they really wish to say that the sacrifice of Christ is in any sense repeated. But clearly there is a large area of theological discussion that would have to be explored before it would be easy for us to take the Lord's Supper with those who, on the face of it, understand it very differently from ourselves. Then the Anglican, in accordance with his tradition, wishes all confirmations to be carried out by a bishop—and this is not easy for us in Britain to agree to. Again, for the Anglican the standing difficulty is bound to remain that we should certainly insist on remaining in communion with Churches which could not be in communion with the Church of England.

And finally, from a theological point of view, we have to face the distinct possibility that in spite of our wish and readiness to agree, we are working with different and perhaps irreconcilable doctrines of the Ministry, and that this is the real cause of all the differences which I have mentioned. The Anglican,

certainly of the Anglo-Catholic school, and perhaps of other schools as well, seems to believe that a minister holds his authority to preach and administer the sacraments from the bishop who ordains him, and so by lineal descent from the Apostles, who received it from the Lord; that is, he receives it from a class of persons *within* the Church, from the Apostles and their successors. We believe on the other hand that a minister is authorized and ordained by the whole Church, and not by certain persons within it, the Church having received its authority from the Lord; a minister, then, is a representative of the whole Church, and the ministers who ordain him are also representatives of the whole Church. I suggest that we may have here a deep difference of theological conviction. It may not come to the surface while we are discussing simply the question of intercommunion, though it may confuse and complicate even these discussions. It will certainly become prominent if ever we begin to think of organic union. I hope and believe that it is capable of resolution. Meanwhile it is plainly the duty of Methodist theologians to make clear to themselves and to the rest of us what *we* mean by the Ministry.

I turn now to what have come to be known as the non-theological factors which impede the cause of Christian unity at every point. They are plain for us all to see, once our eyes are open; they are very intractable and quite unreasonable; they can be disastrous to the very best scheme of human or divine devising. Let me describe to you the Church life of an English town of medium size, say of about 120,000 inhabitants. In this town, of those who are in any way associated with the Church, the older, well-to-do, well-born families, together with the members of the higher professions, the superior civil servants and public officials, the leaders of commerce and industry and the well-established tradespeople, go to the Parish Church—or, rather more often, stay away from it. A generation or two ago, the industrialists and the people in commerce and trade may well have been Nonconformists, probably Methodists, but it has suited their social ambitions and their cultural interests to graduate to the Church of England. The members of the professions not so rich in social prestige, the lesser trades people and public servants, the clerks, the skilful and thrifty artisans, and the members of the so-called working classes who have risen to black-coated jobs, belong to the Free Churches—those of a somewhat higher culture to the Congregationalists, the middle-brows to the Methodists, the lower-brows to the Baptists. The unskilled working-classes belong to the smaller sects, and to the mission halls and churches erected by the bourgeois denominations to cater for the less well-dressed members of the population. The rest of the Churchgoers in the town may be spread fairly evenly over all the Churches, with the proviso that if it is in the South or Midlands of England those who require the services of the Church from time to time, but do not propose to accept any obligations to the Church, regard themselves as Anglicans—'C. of E.'—whereas if it is in the industrial North they may quite well regard themselves as Nonconformists of one sort or another. Of course, there are many exceptions to what I have said, many people who belong to their particular denomination out of real personal conviction; and I have, of course, generalized too much. Moreover the social and educational changes in post-war England are gradually changing our class-structure; it is probably a highly significant thing for the future of Methodism that there are three or four

times more Methodist students at universities and colleges than ever before. But it remains true, generally speaking, that every Church in England is a class Church. And the barriers of class are at least as hard to surmount as any dispute about Apostolic Succession, believers' baptism, or even the infallibility of the Pope.

So much for the major non-theological factors in Church relations. There are, of course, many others. High among them I would place the mass indifference to the whole question of Christian unity on the part of the majority of Church members of all denominations. They profess themselves all in favour of unity, and sometimes express surprise that the matter has not been arranged already by the slow-moving ecclesiastics who clog all the wheels of progress. But if it comes to an actual effort of prayer, an actual experiment in Church relations which means their going down the road to take part in the worship of another denomination, or even reading a pamphlet on the nature of the Church—why, they stay where they are and do as they have always done. It sometimes seems quite useless to plan large schemes of Christian unity before the hard crust of inertia in the local churches has been broken, and it is quite certain that while the large schemes are pending it is a matter of the greatest urgency to hammer away at this crust.

One more non-theological factor needs to be mentioned in a Methodist assembly. Is it not true that we Methodists are sometimes so well satisfied with our own Church-life, our own fellowship, our own discipline, that we are not really interested in the larger concerns of Christ's Holy Catholic Church? Some of our non-Methodist brethren charge us with this; and they express themselves sometimes as being a little tired by our persistent use of the term Methodist, even by our use of the great name of Wesley himself, and the self-praise that seems so often to be implied. I know that over large areas of Methodism these charges are painfully true, and I believe that this does much to hinder godly union and concord.

It has been my business to make a catalogue of the difficulties which beset the path of those who work and pray that the prayer of Jesus Christ that all His disciples should be one may be fulfilled. Taken all together they are truly formidable. Ought we to abandon the whole enterprise and direct our energies elsewhere? To do so would be to turn our eyes away from the new insight into Scriptural truth and the will of God which the Holy Spirit has granted to the men of our time. There have been periods in the history of the Christian Church when divisions have been necessary for the work of God to continue—unhappy divisions, no doubt, but according to the will of God. There are also times when God draws His Church together again, and the continuance of our divisions becomes not only unhappy but sinful. Such a time is surely the present. For so long now each denomination has kept the treasures which God has entrusted to it locked up within its own walls; the time has come to open the gates and share our treasures. We have not the whole truth of God in our own possession; nor has any other Church. We in Methodism have much to give to the universal Church; shall we keep it to ourselves? We have much to learn from those parts of the universal Church from which we are separated; are we going to say that we have no desire to learn it?

(Concluded on page 47)

OUR UNITY IN CHRIST

I PROPOSE to discuss first the God-given unity of the Church; secondly, the common heritage which is a sign of this; thirdly, our appropriation of this in what is called spiritual unity; fourthly, the existing ways in which this unity has been made visible; and, fifthly, ways in which it might be made more fully visible.

First, the God-given unity of the Church has its source in the triune God. When men are in Christ, they are inevitably in Christ together. Unity is rightly ascribed to the Church in the Nicene Creed, not because it has already been fully achieved in practice, but because it is the will of God for the Church, and God sees the Church (as he sees the justified sinner), not in its actual imperfection, but as in Christ it already is.

Secondly, the various groups in Christendom have a considerable heritage in common. We use substantially the same Bible. We mostly say the same creeds or accept the faith contained in them. Most of Christendom observes the two Gospel sacraments. In almost all of Christendom men feel themselves called of God to various ministries. We borrow each others' hymns.

Thirdly, the God-given unity which we have by our common possession of Christ and to which a common heritage bears witness has in some degree been appropriated. Sometimes it has been lacking to such a degree that Churches have even persecuted each other; but in our own day there has been a growth in brotherly love, without which any form of co-operation or visible unity is insincere. We have to some slight extent now learned that thinking someone else to be wrong is compatible with loving him. We are meant to love other Christians as brothers in Christ, not despite their Churchmanship but in one sense because of it, for it is in some sense their Churchmanship, even within a Church so different from ours, which makes them what they are, namely Christians. John Wesley set out the true principles of this in his sermon on 'Catholic Spirit'. To deepen this brotherly love is the main step which we ought to take toward unity; its importance is presupposed in all that follows.

Fourthly, this God-given unity, enshrined in a common heritage, and appropriated in spiritual fellowship, has already to some extent become manifest and visible. The ecumenical movement has fostered closer relations, and there have been some large organic unions and other ventures in ecclesiastical co-operation.

Fifthly, we need to consider what fuller expression this may fittingly receive. In the first place we must continue to be active in all forms of co-operation, especially at the local level, taking more seriously the suggestion of the Lund Conference that the Churches should 'act together in all matters except those in which deep differences of conviction compel them to act separately'.

In the second place, as was said at Lund: 'We look forward to a time when all Christians can have unrestricted Communion in Sacrament and fellowship with each other.'

We Methodists believe in intercommunion. But this needs some clarification. Though with us the Lord's Supper has always been regarded as a converting ordinance, yet it is not quite true to say, as is often said, that we have always practised open communion. In Wesley's day it was necessary to show a class-ticket or a special note of admission. Similarly today in mission fields the Lord's

Supper has a certain place in the disciplinary scheme. The test of admission to it, as to membership, is not conversion, which may indeed come by means of it, but desire, a sincere desire to be saved from our sins through faith in the Lord Jesus Christ; but this must be evidenced in life and conduct. Yet this disciplinary qualification has never, to my knowledge, been used by us against those of other Communion. How could it be? If men are in good standing in another Communion, how can we presume to say that they lack such a desire or fail to evidence it? The modern liberal formula, often used, though not, I suppose, in mission fields, that we welcome 'all who love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity and truth' may not indeed find universal favour; the day may come when it is discarded as lacking in a sense of Churchmanship. But as regards the communicants of other Churches, we do not *enact* that they are welcome; we simply take it for granted; and the same is true of the participation of their ministers, if they wish, in the celebration. They cannot of course *claim* to be invited; but on suitable occasions they *are* invited and some respond. Moreover, we have frequently expressed our view in Great Britain that intercommunion should *precede* organic union. The ecumenical challenge to us here is not to broaden our view, but to respect, without accepting their view, the sincerity of those in some other Communion whose consciences compel them to refuse such invitations and on their own part to make no reciprocal invitation.

There is also the great problem attaching to the other sacrament. But here again our position is clear: we recognize all baptisms performed by water in the triune name, whether of children or adults.

And just as we do not allow differences of order to stand in the way of mutual recognition, so within the bounds of those who acknowledge Jesus as Lord and Saviour we do not allow differences of faith to stand in the way. Difficulties about mutual recognition rarely arise from our side.

The last and most difficult expression of our spiritual unity is a unity which goes beyond mutual recognition. This might take various forms, such as federation. The closest such unity is called organic union. Is there anything wrong with our present divisions? The element of diversity in modes of worship is not in itself wrong, and the question of the indigenization of worship is rightly receiving attention. What is questionable in the lack of organic union, whether this results from geographical separation or denominational division or both, is the lack of any feature in the outward structure of the Churches to correspond to their inner unity. They say they are united in Christ, and they give partial expression to this by acts of intercommunion and mutual recognition, but their governmental structure remains distinct, so that their spiritual unity is not made visible, embodied, incarnate, as it might be.

How much this matter depends on our theory of the visibility of the Church. Some hold, especially on the so-called 'Catholic' side, that the Church is a visible body consisting of a quite definite number of people, whose membership is easily established by outward and visible signs such as baptism. These are not all *good* Christians, nor will they all be saved at the last; but they constitute the Church. Yet even the supporters of this theory have been forced to allow so many exceptions that it virtually breaks down.

Others maintain that the Church is a wholly invisible community, a company of saints known only to God. If you are in Christ, you belong automatically to

this true Church. Such people may then, if they wish, combine together into societies, for mutual benefit and the prosecution of their common task, or just as a concession to human sociality. These societies are popularly known as Churches, but they are not the Church as God understands it, and thus their arrangements, institutions and structure are of no theological importance. This is popularly supposed to be the Protestant view, but none of the great Reformers ever held it; like so much else, it is a product, partly of pietism, partly of liberalism.

Neither of these views will do. The Church is not wholly visible, nor is it wholly invisible; nor again are there two Churches distinct from each other. Rather, to quote the Lund report: 'There are not two Churches, one visible and the other invisible, but one Church which must find visible expression on earth' (p.33). And if the Church must find visible expression, so must the unity which is one of its notes. God works that we have visible institutions, ordinations, sacraments, ministers, discipline; these things, being willed by Him, must not be dismissed as so much ecclesiastical machinery or mere organization, with the implication that unity in these spheres is unimportant. God indeed is not bound, and makes His invisible comment on our arrangements as He wills. But we are bound to seek the fullest possible visible expression of unity.

The obvious starting-point would be to bring into one structure those Methodist Churches which operate in the same territory. After that we must regard regional unions and world confessional movements as complementary to each other. To pursue both fully would lead to a great 'monolithic' Church and this would tend to two great dangers—a rigid centralized bureaucracy and a single visible head. We do not want that. To see what we do want we must look again at the New Testament.

In the New Testament the Church consisted of separate communities, city-churches, in communion with each other. But these separate communities were not modern denominations. Denominations, in the sense of different groups in a city, organized separately and linked with similar groups elsewhere, arose not out of a desire for variety, but out of doctrinal and disciplinary disputes. Each body claimed to be the true Church. The Reformation did not really alter this. Nor did the English Puritans think otherwise. Some wished to reform the Church by tarrying for the magistrate; they continued this till they were ejected from the national Church. Others left at once, because their aim was reformation without tarrying for any; but they did not wish to add a new denomination to some interesting herbaceous border of Churchmanship. They wished to re-establish the true Church without delay.

Some time between Wesley's day and our own the theory has arisen that denominations as such are a blessing. We now see that in many former divisions each side in fact preserved one element of the truth. Ought we not then to establish a society in which these varied heritages can be held together? The trouble with the herbaceous border theory is that only God stands outside to enjoy its variety; we are one of the flowers and we do not share the view. We might indeed try to incorporate the best features of other Communion into our own Methodism, but then we should have a Methodism which would not be content to be one of an interesting variety; it would be the model for all. The *reductio ad absurdum* of the theory that God wants varied denominations is that

presumably, if too many of the other denominations tried to join us, we should have to ask them not to do so but rather to continue to blossom afar.

It is sometimes said that God wills different denominations to provide for different temperaments. The pang of grief we feel when someone leaves Methodism shows that we do not really believe this. We think that Methodism is best. And if we are to cater for varieties of temperament, why not cater in the same way for those of sex, colour, education, race, wealth, and the like? Sometimes we do, and it is to be deplored.

Thus denominationalism as a permanent principle, if taken seriously, which it rarely is, would sap our pride in Methodism. We believe in Methodism; we do not merely think that we are among the temperaments which it is supposed to suit.

National or local Churches do not involve the same dangers, because they are not in competition with each other; but they have obvious dangers of their own.

It is in any case obvious that denominations cannot be abolished in the immediate future. Full allegiance to one particular denomination is at present the only way to be a real Christian. But we question the theory that God wills separate denominations till the Day of Judgement. We may paradoxically learn from the popular defence of that theory at least this, that our denominations have something to give to each other. Therefore we should work toward some more closely-knit structure in which that interchange could be more easily possible. Immediate difficulties need not alter the ultimate goal. The goal may not be entirely clear, but the city-churches of the New Testament drop us a broad hint. We must press on at least to mutual recognition and to such structural changes as that naturally brings with it.

The British Methodist Conference in its statement on *The Nature of the Christian Church* (1937) shows by its lack of complacency about denominations how Methodist thought has moved in the last generation. It has no blue-print, but it shows that in going forward to the Coming Great Church we must go back to the Church of the New Testament. It says:

The Methodist Church, like other world-wide communities within the one Church, cannot be content with the present broken communion of Christendom. Not one of these communities can legitimately claim to be the whole of the Catholic Church on earth. Neither are these separate communities analogous to the local 'Churches' in primitive Christianity.

And later it says:

The Church today is gathered for the most part in certain denominations or 'Churches'. These form but a partial and imperfect embodiment of the New Testament ideal. They are already one in Christ Jesus; they have not to create that unity; it is there; and it is the gift of God. But it is their duty to make common cause in the search for the perfect expression of that unity and holiness which in Christ are already theirs.

A. RAYMOND GEORGE

THE WAY TO UNITY: REGIONAL OR CONFESSIONAL?

I

NO CHRISTIAN can take pleasure in the disunity of the Church. It is no doubt a scandal. Nevertheless, someone has likened it to Noah's Ark: the stench on the inside would not be endurable if it were not for the storm on the outside. With all its imperfections, the Church is the first body with a world-wide outreach. It is man's best hope under God.

Ought we not to thank God for such a day as this? It has been given to our generation as Christians to confess our belief in the Church Universal, not just as a creed and a hope, but as a fact. We can no longer regard our divisions as if they were a part of the faith once delivered unto the saints. Rather, we are summoned to enter into the oneness that has been given to us. We are called upon to repent of our disunity, not by beating our breasts, but by a larger obedience to Christ who asks us to manifest our oneness.

Our subject is 'The Way to Unity: Regional Union or Confessional Ecumenicity'. But both these roads concern us. Our presence here is evidence that we tread upon the latter, and the participation or negotiation of Methodists in nearly a score of plans of union on every continent is testimony to our journeying upon the former. My plea is that these two aspects of Christian unity are not mutually exclusive.

I want to say three things. (1) Christians *are* one. (2) The world does not know that we are one. (3) Let us show that we are one, so that the world may know. What is it that the world is to know? That we are one? No; by our unity the world is to know that Jesus has been sent and that God loves the world.

First, that Christians are one. This is indeed evident in the New Testament. Moreover, there the Church is portrayed as organically one—it is the Body of Christ, and therefore must be one.

In current consideration of Christian unity, I sometimes feel that too much is made of John 17, while insufficient attention is given to other parts of the New Testament, notably Paul's letters. For example, our Lord's prayer 'that they may all be one—so that the world may believe that thou hast sent me' is often used almost as a proof-text in support of a particular kind of monolithic unity. Sometimes, however, it is used to support the view that the Church is just one in spirit. But little attention is given to the fact that in three out of the four times on which this prayer is repeated, Jesus describes that oneness in terms of His own oneness with the Father, 'as we are one'. The unity is not an identity of persons, but an identity of purpose. He further describes it, 'even as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee', and again, 'all mine are thine, and thine are mine'. Can our understanding of the unity of the Churches today be anything less than such a mutual recognition and fellowship among Christian peoples?

Though the New Testament makes it plain that Christians are one, that unity was often threatened. How clear Paul makes this in his First Epistle to the Church at Corinth. The whole letter is almost the *locus classicus* of Christian unity. In Chapter 1 he addresses a Church under threat of schism,

and asks the intentionally absurd question: 'Is Christ divided?' Then all the way to the end of the third chapter, with one resounding blow after another, he asserts that the Church is *One*: because there is *one* Christ; there is *one* source of life; there is *one* message, the Cross; there is *one* Spirit; there is *one* God; there is *one* foundation. In Chapters 10 and 11 the unity is threatened by *apostasy*, by denying that 'Jesus is Lord' and turning to idols, and Paul replies by pointing to the Supper of the Lord, in which the drama of Christian oneness was enacted daily in Corinth; this feast was a present *participation* in Him—a fellowship, a *koinonia* of all Christians. The Corinthian Church was also torn by the arrogant idea that one Christian or group of Christians does not need the others. This Paul discusses in Chapter 12, concerning spiritual gifts, and he asserts that at the very point of our uniqueness we must acknowledge our oneness; for unique gifts of the Spirit are given 'for the common good'.

Moreover, our togetherness is evident not only in the New Testament but by the unity of Spirit which we experience so vividly here in these very days together, as 'the bond of peace'.

Secondly, the world does not know that we are one. Our oneness is like the other side of the moon, which the world never sees; our disunity is placarded before men. In confronting the world's disunity, what testimony and example do we set forth? In the face of the *apartheid* policy in South Africa, is there one Church symbolizing that all men are one? No, there are thirteen hundred sects, all—however feebly—claiming to be inspired of Christ! In India, troubled by the divisiveness of language and province, there are still scores of denominations. In Japan where Japanese Christians left to themselves established a United Church of Christ, Christian sects have nearly doubled since pre-war days, inspired largely by the West. In Central Africa, while in name there is a Church of Christ in the Congo, in fact nearly forty Churches and missions are working there.

The world also sees our disunity at the very point where our oneness should be most evident—at the Lord's Table. The familiar use of the term 'communion' as synonymous with 'denomination' is a measure of our separation. It is a mystery to me why the sacraments should divide us. Why should our divisions centre in the ministry of the sacraments rather than the seemingly far more vital and basic ministry (from the instructional standpoint) of the Word? Yet on reflection, if the first Apostles could make the Last Supper with Jesus an occasion for discussion about which of them was the greatest, it is small wonder that we too should go astray!

In mission lands this question is far from academic. The great Indian Anglican bishop, Azariah of Dornakal, was most insistent on this point. He said years ago: 'Unity may be theoretically a desirable ideal in Europe, but it is vital to the life of the Church in the mission field.' Again he said: 'The divisions of Christendom may be a source of weakness in Christian countries, but in non-Christian lands they are a sin and a scandal.'

Thirdly, let us show that we are one, so that the world may know that Jesus has been sent and that God loves the World.

One way to unity is the way of confessional ecumenicity. The values of such a relationship are apparent. For one thing, it is a corrective to ecclesiastical nationalism. For another, Confessional 'families' can assist regional unity

and strengthen the World Council of Churches. They may, however, develop a self-sufficiency, so that their ecumenical thrust is almost entirely spent within their own households. We Methodists have a heritage, and it is important that we should demonstrate it in action. Together and simultaneously we should address ourselves to the unfinished task of proclaiming the Good News wherever we can. In action together the cause of unity would be furthered. The oneness of Christian fellowship becomes a reality as we embark in service and apostleship.

That regional unity is also a way to Christian unity is abundantly clear. There have been and will be times, places and circumstances in which Methodism will probably join in Church Union. The incentives for this are many. Nowadays, in lands of the Younger Churches, the non-Christian religions are undergoing revival and revision; in such situations there is strength, and maybe even survival, in unity. More compelling as an incentive towards union is the oneness of the New Testament Church. But the great moving force is the will of God. Bishop Lesslie Newbigin once told me that in the negotiations for union in South India, for years each denomination tried to insist that its own point of view prevail. Finally, they agreed on one thing only: that union was the will of God. Having said, 'Thy will be done', they went on rapidly to fulfilment.

There is a rather natural fear on the part of the 'parent' Churches that when their counterparts in other lands join in united Churches, they are lost to them. Here the figure of marriage is useful; for it can be viewed either as the 'loss' of a child, or as the 'gain' of a child, and perhaps some grandchildren too! The fact that at this very conference there are representatives from the United Church of Canada, from the Church of South India, and from Kyodan in Japan, all of which are partly Methodist, testifies that regional unions and confessional ecumenicity are not necessarily contradictory.

We need to remember that the reunion of Churches is not merely a 'coming back' but a 'bringing back', possibly a bringing back of the very qualities we sought when events of history caused our fathers to leave a former Christian fellowship. Have we not often erred as free and evangelical Church people by allowing leaders of Churches with a more rigid and restricted view of the Ministry and the Sacraments to set the standards and to set the pace in discussion of Church union? We too have a view of the Church, of Orders and Membership and the Sacraments. In 1952 at Lund it was declared that 'the nature of the unity toward which we are striving is that of a visible fellowship in which all members acknowledging Jesus Christ as living Lord and Saviour, shall recognize each other as belonging to His Body, to the end that the world may believe'. If this be our aim may we not with humility say that we have already come a long way toward it? Though we are ready to learn from others, we already recognize the free interchange of qualified ministers and members; we are ready for full intercommunion and intercelebration of the sacrament among those who confess Jesus as Saviour and Lord. This is not a position from which we need timidly to retire!

Finally, until we do achieve a fuller measure of Christian unity, we shall do well to follow the advice of that fine Christian statesman, William Paton, to begin now 'to act as if we were united'. Perhaps this has been expressed more

vividly
turesque
One of
to the v
but it w
together
elephant
Myelep
and all s
likewise

WH
h
Church
time'.
tradition
course
theolog
But
and un
method
a partic
internat
The W
ence, a
ians, an
Let
years h
of Can
Negoti
The id
repeated
Council

vividly by an African Christian, John Wesley Shungu. In the African's picturesque way he told me of some villagers who went out to hunt an elephant. One of them shot the elephant. The problem then was to drag the beast back to the village. The one who killed it tried as hard as he could to pull it alone, but it would not budge. When all of them put their ropes around it and pulled together, the job was easy. As they tugged, they sang: 'Our elephant! Our elephant!' But the others heard the successful hunter sing: 'My elephant! My elephant!' Then they stopped. It was only as they all worked together and all sang together that they could make the animal move. We must go and do likewise.

JAMES K. MATHEWS

THE WAY TO UNITY: REGIONAL OR CONFESSIONAL?

II

WHEN William Temple was enthroned as Archbishop of Canterbury, he used a phrase which has become part of the vocabulary of the modern Church; he spoke of the Ecumenical Movement as 'the great new fact of our time'. How thankful we are for it! The atmosphere in which Christians of one tradition meet Christians of another tradition has improved immensely in the course of this century. We use each others' hymns, and we use each others' theologians, and we revere each others' heroes and martyrs.

But when the New Testament urges us forward (as it does) from toleration and understanding and co-operation, to actual Reunion, a major choice of method has to be made. Ought Reunion to be discussed and negotiated within a particular territory, in a given local and national setting? Or ought it to be international? (After all, the machinery for international discussion now exists. The World Methodist Council is paralleled by the Anglican Lambeth Conference, and by the vigorous world organizations of the Lutherans, the Presbyterians, and the Baptists.)

Let me develop the question this way. The Reunion projects of recent years have all been local, confined to a particular territory. The United Church of Canada has been followed by Unions in Japan, France, South India, Spain. Negotiations of similar patterns are well advanced in Ceylon and North India. The idea of a single Protestant Church of the U.S.A. has been canvassed repeatedly since the War. The Moderator of the British Free Church Federal Council proposed only a few months ago that as 1662 hammered disunity

into our English Church life, 1962 might be used to mark the return to a single, united Church.

Now I am prepared to recognize without reserve the immense achievements of union schemes like South India. (As one who attended Evanston I have never wavered in the conviction that the Church of South India, despite its comparative smallness, made the most constructive contributions to that Assembly.) None the less, before this is accepted as the invariable pattern of advance, I believe serious consideration should be given to the alternative—i.e. reunion at the confessional and international level; i.e. reunion, not between (say) Methodists and Presbyterians in a single territory, but between World Methodism and World Presbyterianism.

As I see it, unity achieved at the local level, within the frontiers of a single nation, goes in peril of repeating what was the one disastrous feature of the Reformation. We are all aware how then a mighty religious movement was in part channelled to serve political ends—with the result that within a few years the alternative to a single corrupt Church was not a single reformed Church; it was a Church of England, a Church of Scotland, and a mass of State Churches in Germany!

I believe the same thing is happening again. The evidence laid before the British Conference's Commission on Wales in the past twelve months has suggested repeatedly that there are Christians in Wales who regard doctrine as of far less importance than 'Welshness'; so that Arminianism and Calvinism could easily be reconciled once a national Church was created! I mention the peril in my own country lest I should be thought to be criticizing only the Churches of the Far East. But it is in the Far East that the situation appears most threatening. Was it not said by the Chinese representative at the recent Budapest meeting of the World Council of Churches' Central Committee that China did not need theological writings from the West, because the Chinese Church was working out a *Chinese Theology*? Those who were present at the World Methodist Executive Committee immediately before Evanston will recall how the evidence accumulated—from China, Japan, the Philippines, Ceylon, India. At the present time plans are well-nigh complete for union in North India, and union in Ceylon. The Churches negotiating are, in general, the Churches which went into the Church of South India, and they are served by the same Missionary Societies. Yet the proposals are not for an extension of the Church of South India; for the creation of new provinces of the one existing Church: they are for the building of two more autonomous, national denominations! Why? Is that the height of Christian wisdom? If South India is the way forward, why is something separate and different needed in Ceylon and in Pakistan?

Let me make it quite clear. I know that our overlapping on the Mission Field is confusing and scandalous. I have every sympathy with the young African who is perplexed at having to choose between a Cambridge Anglican Mission, and a Norwegian Lutheran, and an American Methodist! And further, I am willing to grant that (consciously or unconsciously) some missionaries spent time 'westernizing' instead of evangelizing. We should all agree that Christian worship is at its best when it is related to local, rather than imported, art-forms. But when all that has been said, I do not believe we have

solved our problems when we have organized a national Church. Talk to our brethren from Sweden, Norway, and Switzerland, who can speak from experience! The Church that belongs to one territory comes to stand, without realizing it, for the political, or racial, or economic interests of that locality, rather than for the multi-racial, universal, Kingdom of God.

Let me illustrate. We felt it to be more than bad-taste, it was a contradiction of the Gospel, when Hitler founded the 'German Christians'. But although it was less deliberate, wasn't it just as wrong-headed when in Britain, during the War, 'National Days of Prayer' were advertised by some churches as 'Days of National Prayer'? And however ill-advised we may judge the British Government to be in its handling of the Cyprus situation, isn't there also something ill-advised about Cypriot politics when they have a national Church at the core, and an Archbishop as the spokesman of national political opinion?

Watching the unhappy unfolding of events in South Africa, how thankful we must have been that the Christian conscience is represented there not by a 'conditioned' national Church, but by several international denominations! The World Church has had an influence in South Africa far more effective than a territorial Church could have had.

We were encouraged by the Lund Faith and Order Conference to look for the 'non-theological factors' in world-wide Christian disunity. I suggest that Reunion based on a single political state is fostering one of the most divisive of those factors! Christian Unity is of the essence of the Gospel—but to avoid misrepresenting the Gospel it needs to be international. St. Paul's argument in Galatians against a Church that was built on Race, and on Jewish Nationalism is as relevant today as when it was written. Wesley put the matter baldly, but I think faithfully, in the *Minutes of Conference* of 1747. The question, 'What instance or ground, is there in the New Testament for a National Church?', having been discussed, he records the judgement: 'We know none at all: we apprehend it to be a merely political institution.' What William Paton (that great Presbyterian) said at the Oxford Conference of 1937 is even more pertinent now than then: 'The Church is not, and can never be, the Church of a local community. The Church in any particular locality is part of a universal community, and is known to be such. It must therefore evoke the hostility of those for whom the claims of nationality and race are supreme.' The preparatory documents for the First Assembly of the World Council of Churches had the same emphasis: 'The Church as God purposes it is a unique community of men without boundaries of nation or race, culture or tradition.'

Brethren, the Church of Jesus is meant to be one. None of us, in the succession of Wesley, assenting to his sermon 'On a Catholic Spirit', but must be praying to be used in the restoring of Christian Unity. But it is a unity where 'there cannot be Greek and Jew, circumcised and uncircumcised, barbarian, Scythian, slave, freeman: but Christ is all and in all'. We may properly ask whether anything substantial will have been achieved if in a generation's time we have discarded the names 'Methodist', 'Presbyterian', 'Anglican', 'Lutheran', only to substitute for them 'African Christian', 'Formosan Christian', 'American Christian', 'Brazilian Christian'—and forty others?

I know that unity achieved in Australia or in West Africa this year would bring massive relief to passionate lovers of our Lord there; but if we could have something at world-wide level, inclusive rather than exclusive, a scheme of Reunion into which we could all move as we were ready, a scheme that didn't depend on where we lived, or the language we spoke, or the colour of our skin, wouldn't that be worth an extra generation of negotiation? *I think so.* The way forward is surely to make fuller use of the World Confessional organizations—the Lambeth Conference, the World Lutheran Organization, the World Methodist Council, and so on.

What the Archbishop of Canterbury said in his famous 'Cambridge' sermon of 1946 was wise, and should be said for us as Methodists also. 'The Church of England by the nature of the case can only move with its fellow (Anglican) Churches in every part of the world. It cannot submit itself to any constitution convenient for these islands unless it is one which in principle its related Churches can also adopt themselves.' Instead of piecemeal discussions between Anglicans and Presbyterians and Methodists in New Guinea this year, and Peru next year, and Northern Ireland the year after, why shouldn't we equip and then authorize the World Confessional bodies to discuss a scheme of Reunion that would be 'catholic' from the start?

Please don't interpret this as a plea for non-co-operation at the local level until Reunion is feasible at World level. I want to see everything done in co-operation that need not be done in isolation. But while we co-operate to the full in every territory, let us make it clear that from now on Methodists will go into no scheme that is not international in intention. We meet under the slogan that the Methodists are one people in all the world.

My plea is that we not only say that, but also act upon it: so that as we move forward to the Ecumenical Church which is truly the Body of Christ, we do so *together*.

WILFRED WADE

THE
C
the Br
World
the bes

It is
should

First
at the
of all t
World

'Our p
make a
out the
do our

evange
Mission
that th
so am
as a w

Seco

In son
offensi
questio
where

receiv
is alwa
Christ

Prop

It show
and w
at vari
arbitra

which
becom
patter

countr
resour
this ex

and so
the of

This
enterp
Where

the di

WORLD MISSIONARY STRATEGY

THIS SUBJECT finds a place on our programme chiefly because a Commission on the Missionary Obligation of the Church, set up by the British Conference in 1953, suggested that at the next meeting of the World Methodist Council a committee should examine World Strategy and the best use of our resources.

It is a vast subject, and I can only touch one fringe of it in this paper. I should like to begin with certain reminders.

First, Methodism is only a small part of the Christian Church, claiming at the most eighteen per cent of the 'Protestants' and possibly six per cent of all the Christians in the world. We take our place along with others in the World Council of Churches, and the World Methodist Council has declared: 'Our purpose in promoting the closer unity of Methodism is that this may make a stronger contribution to the larger unity of Christ's Church throughout the world.' So too with missionary obedience and endeavour: we must do our utmost to avoid rivalry with other Churches in the tasks of world evangelism, and work in co-operation with them through associations of Missionary Societies, National Christian Councils, and so on. God forbid that the missionary strategy of world Methodism should be so narrowly or so ambitiously conceived among us as to be contrary to Christian strategy as a whole.

Secondly, the use of the word 'missionary' itself presents certain problems. In some parts of the world it is almost impossible to dissociate it from the offensive idea of cultural aggression and imperialism. This is not a mere question of Communist propaganda. It reflects a real problem in all lands where the Church has been planted by pioneer evangelism from outside and receives support from a 'mother-church' elsewhere. In such a situation there is always a danger of 'cultural imperialism' or of its being suspected by loyal Christians as well as by others.

Properly speaking the word 'missionary' has no racial or national connotation. It should relate to all evangelism, with no separation between what is domestic and what is foreign. We all increasingly recognize this, and try to express it at various points of our organization. But for the purpose of this paper we must arbitrarily limit the use of the term 'missionary' to that evangelistic out-reach which Christians should have to lands beyond their own. Thank God, this is becoming more and more a two- or three-way traffic. Nevertheless the general pattern is still that of workers and grants going out from certain sending countries to other lands where the Church is younger and poorer in material resources. Our consideration of missionary strategy is inevitably related to this existing pattern, with all its dangers of cultural imperialism, and of ignorant and self-satisfied patronage on the one hand and discontented dependence on the other.

Thirdly, in speaking of 'strategy', let us not imagine that the world missionary enterprise of Methodism can be directed from New York, London, or Sydney. Wherever the Church is, there is the Mission. Responsibility and initiative, the discussion of policy and the provision of funds and personnel, the vitally

essential work of training—all these increasingly must be shared between the 'Field' and the 'Home Base'. The key-word is 'partnership', not 'direction'.

More important still, we must not commit the blasphemy of conceiving missionary strategy as something man-centred and man-controlled. It is Christ who builds His Church, not we; the strategy of all true evangelism is His, not ours. In what strange and unpredictable ways He breaks in upon men's plans for His work! Paul is forbidden by the Spirit to go where he wishes in Asia Minor; he is drawn instead to Troas, and there receives the call to cross into Europe. Thomas Coke, sailing for Nova Scotia in 1786, is driven instead by storm to Antigua, two thousand miles away, and finds himself preaching to the slaves there—an event which many reckon as the real beginning of Methodist world missions. So human calculations are upset and God works His sovereign will.

At the heart of Christian obedience and Christian enterprise, lies this paradox: God is the supreme Strategist, and it is He who does His work in the world; yet He does not do it without us. He uses us as His workmen; He also calls us to intelligent planning under His own direction.

Having reminded ourselves of these three points, we must now pause and consider the stupendous nature of the missionary task. After these nineteen-and-a-half centuries, over half of the world's people either have never heard of Christ or have no knowledge of what the Incarnation means. Every year, at present, 25,000,000 people are added to the world's population, and the increase is swiftest in the non-Christian areas. In the words of the British Conference Commission: 'If men spoke a century ago of the millions who had never heard, we can only say that today more millions than ever have never heard the Gospel.' There is today a resurgence of Buddhism and of Hinduism, and Islam is making great advances in West Africa. In the lands of the older Churches what we call missionary interest is slowly increasing; but we are worlds away from the condition in which the whole Church is aglow with the passionate desire to make Christ known to all men everywhere, and is ready for real sacrifice in that supreme cause. Methodists as a whole are not, like the first Christians, a Church under the Cross and witnessing to the power of the Resurrection.

In view of all this, what I am trying to say in this paper may seem quite trivial; but it is said on the assumption that everyone in this Conference realizes the over-arching immensity of the task and our need of a great new baptism of the Holy Spirit to come upon the Methodist Church in all the earth, if we are to play our divinely appointed part in it.

How are we at present trying to cope with this task? It has been calculated that there are nearly 40,000,000 in the world Methodist community. A little over 4,000,000 are in the 'Mission Fields' of the main sending bodies, divided thus:

Connected with	North America	3,208,000
"	"	Britain	.	.	.	685,000*
"	"	Australia and New Zealand	.	.	.	131,000
"	"	South Africa	.	.	approximately	10,000

* Or, including the section of the Church of South India which was formerly Methodist, 935,000.

In these areas there is wasteful overlapping at one or two points, but the extent of this is really quite small. The weakness is rather that we do not help each other enough by a combined study of problems and methods. Reports and other literature are exchanged between the Mission Boards, but some of this material might give an outsider the impression that in each sending country we thought our own was the only Methodist missionary work in the world. We do not get much in each other's way; rather we have tended to ignore one another to an extent unseemly for a family.

There are two types of suggestion for radical re-planning, which may appear attractive at first sight but will not, I believe, bear close examination.

First, it will be said perhaps that our present regional arrangements are chaotic and wasteful, and need tidying up. Why should Methodism in the West Indies owe allegiance to so many different groups, in Britain, the U.S.A., and Canada? Why should American and British brands of Methodism be found side by side in North India, Burma, and Southern Rhodesia? What is the sense of Methodists in so many countries of Europe being linked with the U.S.A.? Let us have a radical re-grouping. Let North America for example take responsibility for missionary work throughout the Caribbean and in the lands of East, South-East, and South Asia. Let the Rhodesias be linked with South Africa, the rest of Africa and Europe with Britain, and the Pacific island groups with Australasia. That would end waste and overlapping, and make us properly streamlined.

Some such wholesale reshuffling might conceivably be advocated. But, like most apparently simple solutions, this one will not do, because it largely ignores past history and present human relationships. Methodists are one people in all the world; but the one is made up of many, and the many have very different traditions and characteristics. These differences are not creases which can be ironed out in a sort of missionary organizational laundry. The upheaval involved in any radical regrouping would destroy much, and I doubt if it would create anything of real benefit. Even if each of the new groups thus formed were to achieve harmony within itself, the result would be three or four blocks of Methodism, each more monolithic than at present, but each more preoccupied with itself and less likely to have fruitful contact with the rest. We should have defeated our own object in making the change.

Alternatively, a second suggestion might be made. It might be argued that strategy demands some central authority set up by the World Methodist Council, to decide missionary policy all over the world, choosing the best methods and applying them, bringing people together for consultation, spreading information; this, and this alone, would eliminate waste and achieve the necessary mobility and drive.

However attractive this plea may sound, I am sure it should be resisted, for these reasons among others:

(1) The World Methodist Council, by its own statement, 'exercises no legislative power and exerts no control over any Methodist body'. It would be untrue to its own purpose if it set up a central controlling authority in missionary administration.

(2) God's strategy is not that of the big battalions or the military High

Command. He works by more devious and unexpected ways, and the operation of His Spirit is infinitely varied and neither tidy nor predictable.

(3) As we have seen, our relations are those of partnership, and as the Church on the frontiers develops, direction from Mission Board Headquarters becomes less and less appropriate. The dictates of a new Supreme Command would be still more out of place.

(4) At some points geography and history combine to rule out the idea of central direction. Consider for example the Methodist Churches in Polynesia and Melanesia, with their splendid record of cannibalism conquered and life transformed. For over 100 years they have been connected with an autonomous Conference (later several Conferences) in Australasia. They have their own special characteristics, tasks, and problems. It is conceivable (though very unlikely) that at some time they might call for help in personnel or funds from Methodism elsewhere; it is *not* conceivable that their work should be controlled from somewhere outside the region.

We must therefore reject both these suggestions. The fact is that the widely varying characteristics of different regions clearly call for a very varied strategy.

Some situations urgently demand the corporate union of Methodists with others on a regional basis. This has already happened in Canada, Japan, France, South India, and Spain. It is under discussion in North India and Pakistan, Ceylon, and elsewhere. Is there a danger in the formation of such 'national' Churches? Yes, if we mean Churches which are under State Control, or which weaken the witness of the Church as a supra-national fellowship. But there is no reason why a regional union should necessarily result in this. My conviction is that the weakness and sin of disunity are most clearly seen in the local setting. This therefore is the place where corporate reunion ought to begin; it is at the grass-roots that the weed-killer needs to be applied. Where there is the opportunity and it can be done in good conscience as to Christian truth, surely we must encourage our people to go into such a regional union, losing the name of Methodists but taking the essence of Methodism into the united Church. This need not necessarily mean the weakening of Methodist ties, though it will certainly involve the end of Methodist *control*.

In other areas, where union of this kind is not feasible at present, there is need for closer co-operation between contiguous Methodist groups, which may later lead to actual fusion. Such fusion took place in 1950 between Methodists of Australian and British affiliation in the Lucknow and Banaras District of North India. A similar development was on the way in China before 1949 between the Methodists connected with the United States and Britain.

Now a word about two elements in the Mission of the Church which must be held in perpetual tension with one another.

Mission is essentially the outgoing of the experience of Christ from one person to another. He comes to us individually, and so too He sends us to others: 'As the Father hath sent me, even so send I you.' Note how the 'Faith Mission' strikes this note of immediacy. A congregation send forth their missionary with prayer, to a place chosen by jabbing down a pin upon a map. Henceforward their missionary prayer and giving are directed through this personal channel. Everything has a direct and spontaneous 'New Testament'

quality
it repr
central
Over
task,
strong
the du
everyw
gent an
If w
tension
but pe
with on
Apar
co-ope
First
British
cleares
have b
trainin
in the
be a jo
buildin
Seco
gratefu
genero
perille
cannot
we can
reinfor
ing nee
Asia.
Singap
trainin
there i
'As f
tion, l
Africa
on met
South
Method
and th
and wi
toward
Church
Liberia
the G
India

quality. This is, I know, an over-simplification—possibly a caricature. But it represents something important, and is perhaps a warning against over-centralization.

Over against this, set the immense and complex nature of the missionary task, the countless multitudes yet unreached, the necessity of building up strong regional Churches and not scattered units, the limited resources and the duty of using them without waste, and the need to draw all Christians everywhere into the common enterprise of evangelism. All this calls for intelligent and co-ordinated planning.

If we are to hold these two essential elements together in proper and fruitful tension, I think it follows that what we need is not a new top-level organization, but persistence in the tasks severally entrusted to us, and more consultation with one another about them.

Apart from what I have already mentioned, there are two pieces of new co-operation to record.

First, in Southern Rhodesia, communities connected with American and British Methodism are found in adjacent areas and slightly over-lapping. The clearest need is for joint work in the field of training. Long-standing obstacles have been gradually overcome and there are agreed plans for united theological training, of ministers in the British institution at Epworth and of lay workers in the American one at Old Umtali, with mixed staffs at both. There will also be a joint Community Centre at Salisbury as soon as all the funds needed for buildings are in hand.

Secondly, there is co-operation in South-east Asia. In Britain we are more grateful than we can say to the Methodist Church in the United States for generous help given when war conditions and difficulties of exchange imperilled our overseas work in certain areas. This is the kind of benefit which cannot easily be repaid; but we in Britain are happy if even in a small way we can respond to an invitation from the Division of World Mission for a reinforcement of its work. There is such an opportunity today in the challenging need for Christian work among the Chinese people dispersed in South-east Asia. We have recently sent a missionary to join the staff of Trinity College, Singapore, and hope soon to send a few others to help with lay leadership training in Malaya, Sumatra, and Sarawak. About these and other concerns there is regular and increasing co-operation between New York and London.

As for the points at which we should begin or extend the practice of consultation, let me put a few questions. Would the missionary work of the South Africa Conference in Swaziland and Basutoland benefit from consultations on method with the Churches of American and British origin elsewhere in the Southern part of Africa? Would consultation be mutually helpful between Methodists of different origins in Northern Rhodesia and the Congo, in Liberia and the Gold Coast? As Methodists in West Africa consult with one another and with the British Conference as to their future development, looking either toward an autonomous Conference for the region or toward union with other Churches, what desire will there be to share in these plans, on the part of the Liberian Church and the smaller Churches of American origin in Sierra Leone, the Gold Coast, and Nigeria? As plans for Church Union develop in North India and Pakistan, and as anxious questions are asked on this subject by

American Methodists, can any helpful answers be given by British Methodism, from its experience of Union already achieved in South India? Can we help one another by more consultation on such subjects as missionary recruitment and training, and medical missionary policy?

On the pattern of our co-operation I should like to make three brief points:

First, no new machinery need be set up. The means of consultation exist, in the Secretariats of the Mission Boards and the Church organization of the various regions concerned.

Secondly, while perhaps consultation between the Boards in Australasia and America may be useful, and while possibly there should be more co-operation between the various Methodist bodies in North America, the chief need at the moment is for continued and increased contact between New York and London; and this we are already planning.

Thirdly, contacts between Mission Boards and their Secretaries are not enough. Policy is not to be dictated from Mission Board Headquarters, but must be shaped more and more in consultation with the Church on the frontiers. How can our co-operation come nearer to the grass-roots? We must seriously consider the calling together of area groups in Asia and Africa and elsewhere, for the kind of consultation which I have in mind.

This suggestion cannot be made light-heartedly, for to carry it out would be costly both in time and in money. Co-operation is never an easy way out; it always makes big demands on time and nearly always involves increased expenditure. But we must not shrink from it on that account, if this is the way the Holy Spirit leads.

I conclude on a note which I tried to sound at the beginning. We must remember again that we are but a small part of the Church militant, and cannot set ourselves up as the grand planners of the campaign. In personal and common commitment we must appeal afresh to our people in every land and help them to fulfil their missionary obligation, and must bring to that fulfilment the most dedicated, thorough and united planning of which we are capable. But to what end? Not that the Methodist Church may be glorified, but that she may play her part alongside others and in the fullest possible comradeship with them, according to that divine strategy whereby God wills to take up all Christian people into His work of redemption, and use them in bringing the Gospel to all mankind. To Him alone be the glory!

BASIL CLUTTERBUCK

CHRISTIANS AND THE MODERN STATE

I SUPPOSE it is strictly true to say that every nation which now successfully claims national sovereignty is a 'modern State', and the world patchwork of such societies is remarkably varied. There is not much in common between Sweden and Sudan, and there are perceptible differences between such contemporary federal societies as the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R.—a comment which the citizens of both would regard as a considerable understatement.

When there is such wide variety, both in the conditions now of nation-States and in the rapidity with which they are changing, generalization has to be cautious. But if we look at trends as well as at actualities, a basic pattern of the modern State begins to emerge—perhaps the first general global pattern for many centuries.

The leaders of the peasant communities of the world believe that the economic value of industrialization is one of the clear lessons of recent history. The leaders of the larger peasant communities are certain that industrialization is the source of effective military power. So, to raise the standard of living, or to develop striking power in war, mills and mines and factories begin to dot the rural landscape. The trend in all communities is to larger industrial units. A complementary trend is to larger and more tightly organized labour unions.

The second emerging feature of the pattern of the modern State is urbanization. The drift from the land to the towns proceeds steadily; for in the towns are to be found work, domestic conveniences, and social amenities. The framework of social living changes, and with it change the bases of political judgement and of political manipulation.

The third feature, deliberately sought by some States, observed in others by the transfer of traditional names to new procedures, and stubbornly resisted in others, is the trend to the centralization of State power. A peasant society, or a practically decentralized feudal society, can get by with very little Governmental control. Not so a heavily industrialized society dependent on an elaborate financial system. Taxation, exchange control regulations, import restrictions, the protection of industries regarded as essential, the real or presumed demands of national defence—these and many other causes put the reins of power ever more firmly in the hands of Government.

Reinforcing this latter trend is the claim of the modern State to absolute national sovereignty, though here there is a divergence of great importance. The nations recently become independent or recently become strong are more insistent on national sovereignty than those whose lusty and aggressive youth is long past.

Yet another feature of the State today is the trend to secularism, a consequence of the emphasis laid in an industrial civilization on material economic values. The clearest example of this is the orthodox Marxist atheism of the Soviet Union. But there are other contributory reasons. The militant secularism of Latin and Latin-American countries is a reaction against ecclesiastical political domination. The benevolent secularism of the U.S.A., toward which the United Kingdom and Scandinavia seem to be slowly drifting, is caused by

the desire of Government not to offend strong and fairly evenly balanced religious groups and not to get involved in their contentions.

Broadly speaking then, the Christian in the modern State lives with the intertwined social, political, and economic problems of industrialization, urbanization, centralization, and secularization. The social framework encourages a lonelier and a more artificial life. Communal and kinship ties are relaxed. The individual leads a healthier, less arduous and less dangerous life. He lives also a less creative life. The symbol of our age is five million families sitting isolated in their own homes all watching the same TV programme.

The average citizen knows much more today of the dramatic crises of national and international politics, is more sharply aware how directly and how swiftly they affect him, and feels all the more vividly how little he is able to influence or control them. He has much more leisure than his ancestors had, and is encouraged to think that leisure is life. Work is an unfortunate necessity, an interruption of living, endured and accepted because it brings the money to procure satisfaction in the hours when work has ended.

I have reduced large generalizations to the scale of individual action of set intent. The loosely phrased biological analogies of some sociologists, and the even looser oratory of most politicians, conveys the impression that the State is a living organism. It is not. It is the articulation, regulation, and balancing of individual actions and desires. Political and economic systems may be shaped by intelligent planning, by patient persuasion, by cunning cajolery, or by downright stupidity, but in the final analysis they depend upon, and are moulded by, the wants and aspirations of human beings.

But wants and aspirations are based upon what men really believe to be the 'good life'. If I believe that money or power hold the secret of successful living, I shall seek them. If I believe that the chief end of man is to know God and to enjoy Him for ever, I shall seek God. So the Christian, simply because he is a Christian, confronts the State in two inseparably related ways. Whatever the social or political order, he must seek to live by faith and love. The political system may be corrupt or cruel, the economic order unjust, and the moral code of society debased. Nevertheless, he will be generous and just, truthful and honest, kind and forbearing. In an evil time he will seek to do good, loving God and loving his neighbour as himself.

But because no man is an island, that sort of life influences the form and quality of society whether he wills it or no. With all due respect to Adam Smith, the uncontrolled disposition to seek purely selfish ends leads inevitably to conflict and chaos. It is when there appears to be no other power capable of checking the disruptive self-will of self-regarding men that the way to strong-arm politics is made easy. When to self-regard is added the disposition to evade irksome responsibility, the way to tyranny is wide open. Political liberty is a rare and precious thing, hardly won and easily lost. It demands and depends upon men and women of integrity and charity, ready to acknowledge that they are their brother's keepers. In this, as in so many other departments of the social order, the believing Christian is the preserver of sound values in a society that would otherwise decay. He is the salt of the earth.

And he is not salt only. He does not merely prevent things from getting worse; he also helps them to get better. It was because the Christians of the

first century did what seemed to them to be the right thing to do in loving obedience to the commands of the Gospel that the first Widows' Pensions Scheme developed.

It should be noted that the Pensions Scheme grew out of response to the Gospel. It was not a sociological experiment which used religion as a convenient means to a non-religious end. There is an insidious temptation so to make use of religion. Christians whose word is their bond make good citizens, but the gospel of redeeming love must not be used simply to produce good citizens. One result of living in the modern State is loneliness and a slackening of the social ties that strengthen life. A church can, and does, make good those deficiencies; offering fellowship and shared responsibilities. But if it offers primarily a friendly welcome and a crowded programme, it is failing the Lord it was built to serve.

What went wrong with the 'social gospel' in the generation immediately past was that it put 'social' first, and a diluted gospel second. Men and women of noble intention strove to implement the Sermon on the Mount while pushing into the background the Cross and the Resurrection—and found that their fine phrases and benevolent exhortations splashed ineffectively on the rocks of sin.

Christians are living now in the reaction to that failure. Our stress is upon an eschatological theology, mistakenly regarded as a theology of judgement and last things that makes this present world of no account. It is becoming popular once more to divorce the saved from the secular, to contrast the eternal and the temporal, and so—with the best intentions and out of an earnest if misguided desire to avoid the mistakes of our fathers—to minimize the meaning of the Incarnation of our Lord.

It is understandable that Christians should recoil from a presentation of the Gospel that makes it no more than pious politics, but unfortunate that they should recoil into an equal distortion. Christian faith is rooted in what God in Christ has done for man through His Passion and Resurrection. What God has done He has done for man in society as well as for man as an individual. It must be so. We are born into a sinful society, and no individual redemption can break all the bonds of sin.

The explicit teaching of the New Testament is so clear that it ought to need no comment. But how often it has been forgotten or denied! Indeed, much of the difficulty that confronts us today in industry and society stems from the tragic fact that when the Industrial Revolution was transforming social life, it was unchecked by Christian judgement, because good Christians thought that religion had nothing to do with economics.

The Christian is intensely but not exclusively concerned with the agonies and follies and perversions of the sinful social order, because he is a channel of the personally and socially redeeming grace of the Holy Spirit, because he accepts completely the fact that God is Lord of every human activity and relationship, and because, believing that the pattern of full human living is laid up, in the providence of God, in the Kingdom that is and is to be, he takes it from God and does not try to impose it upon Him.

How should that concern be finding expression at this present time? There are many urgent problems that should vex our consciences and compel us to action, but I would suggest that Christian analysis and, if need be, attack, should be upon the foundations of contemporary society. Struggles over

superficial consequences waste time and energy, unless they are directly related to faith.

I am convinced that our primary task is to illustrate the insufficiency of secularism. The natural, secular order can and should serve the best interests of citizens, but the natural order unfortified is powerless against the assault of evil. It depends for its health and life upon a higher order. The tragedy is that this simple truth would sound utterly meaningless to so many today. Perhaps our opportunity lies in the analysis of Marx-Leninism. By that I mean the point-by-point examination of the theology, history, psychology, and sociology of the Marxist orthodoxy. Every Communist revolution so far has been led by discontented intellectuals, not by proletarian rebels. Moreover, the theoretical foundations of Marxism, though well camouflaged by pedantic jargon, are very shaky. The crudities and excesses of Communist State Centralization flow from a crude and indefensible secularism. It is the obligation of Christians, and especially of those of the household of faith in secularized lands, to proclaim that the Lord God omnipotent reigneth. And though I choose the Soviet Empire as an obvious example, I do not forget that there are other crude secular orders in our contemporary world.

I believe that we shall do well to recognize more clearly the nature of the necessity of the State. It is easy to be cynical about politicians, because they are cynical about each other, but on the occasions in human history when the apparatus of State has collapsed, the lot of those involved has been dreadful.

If ridicule of the State is foolish, idolatry is worse. The factors which make State organization necessary determine and limit its functions. The long-established concept of the State as a legally limited central authority responsible for confirming and defining the activities of citizens, but not responsible for innovation or interference with legal activities, has been perforce modified to safeguard the weak and the poor. The piece-meal modification, however, has created a State which is a congerie of authoritative sections. On to principles ultimately based on Christian ethics and common law, have been thrust ideas and attitudes based on Utilitarianism. The result has been not only to regard the individual as a social unit rather than as a person, not only to diminish material and political liberty, but, even more seriously, to mechanize personality by assuming that the criteria of physical science are decisive. One function of the Christian Church is to counter the unbalance of human exaggeration. In the last century we needed to assert the claims of society in a context of riotous individualism. Now we need to assert the rights and dignities of the person.

This also demands a standard of reference to be found outside the actual life of contemporary society, a standard by which it can be assessed, commended or condemned. The standard is the doctrine of the nature and purpose of man. Allied to it is the doctrine of the sovereignty of God, a doctrine desperately needed today to check the blasphemous and destructive doctrine of the absolute sovereignty of the State. The State is the servant of God, not the master of men.

Recognition of, and proclamation of, the State as the servant of God and man involves judgement of its actions in terms of obedience to God's will rather than in terms of national self-interest. Measures by which the State, acting on behalf of the total national community, takes responsibility for the sick and the widowed and the destitute, are to be commended. The extravagant use of men

and materials in war and preparation for war, a use which diverts them from constructive and creative ends, is to be deplored and condemned, as is the underlying concept of the State as a fighting-machine. But here again the Christian must witness that peace on earth comes only when glory is given to God in the highest.

The Christian must recognize the stark realities of our time. More than half the world's children are diseased, more than two-thirds the world's population under-nourished. The common enemies of mankind are poverty, hunger, ignorance, and disease. It is not the will of God that His little ones should be scarred by yaws or rotted by leprosy. The times of our ignorance God winked at, but now we know these things, and through Church and State together—as in the co-operation of the United Nations Relief and Work Agency with the Near East Christian Council to meet the needs of Arab refugees in Palestine—must seek to do His will.

This is not a comprehensive survey of the Christian response to modern society, but a short list of examples of the sort of witness demanded of us. What they come down to is the obligation to become aware of the world we live in and to become involved in its perplexities. Awareness is not easy, for we all live in blinkers. Involvement is not easy, except for a few born meddlers, for the Christian is sorely tempted to quit the dust and heat of dreary conflict and to find quiet and refuge in the worship of the Church. The temptation is particularly acute when the conflict appears to be going against us. It is even more difficult for some of the younger Churches. They form a minority of the population of their countries. Not very long ago the first converts had to leave their own people and to separate themselves to form a Church. They clung together for comfort and encouragement. But the Church was not intended to be a retreat from the pain of the world Christ came to save. We come to worship to be strengthened for living. It is a significant and splendid thing that one of the clearest calls to Christian social action has come from a young minority Church: the report on *Church and State* issued by the Methodist Church in Ceylon.

To be aware and involved is to be tackling the real problems of the day. If only men grounded in faith would wrestle with the problems of their own social situation, knowing the facts too well to be fobbed off by slick answers, respecting the truth too well to ignore uncomfortable facts, loving their Lord too well to accept expedient and unchristian solutions! In such tension of faith and experience, when in travail of spirit a man brings his experience to God and God to his experience, the next step is revealed. Through such a Church the Lord claims again His Kingdom.

EDWARD ROGERS

NUCLEAR KNOWLEDGE AND CHRISTIAN RESPONSIBILITY

ON 1ST JANUARY 1954 the *Manchester Guardian* introduced its readers to the New Year in these words: "This is the eighth year of the Atomic Age." In some subtle sense there was the underlying suspicion that perhaps B.C. and A.D. were no longer relevant as chronological guides—they had been superseded by A.A.! Now the atomic age means nuclear knowledge. And if there is any measure of truth in that suspicion that atomic energy has come to dominate mankind's thinking about the future, then there can be no further justification needed for our concern today with this new knowledge. The Christian abdicates his position if he refuses to face the implications of this strange and powerful influence, and leaves to others the answering of those fundamental questions which accompany it.

But, first, what is this nuclear knowledge? In its simplest terms it is the discovery of a way of releasing energy, which we can then use. This energy comes from the nucleus, which is the central part of the atom. If the atom is a heavy atom, like uranium, we release energy by splitting its nucleus into two approximately equal parts: if it is a light atom, like hydrogen, we get our energy by fusing two or more of these nuclei together to form a composite heavier nucleus.

Now at first sight it may seem strange that we should refer to the possession of large amounts of energy as if it were one of the really great issues in modern civilization. Yet it is. We can see this most easily if we trace the story of man's developing civilization from the first stage of complete dependence on human effort, through a second stage of increasing dependence on coal and oil, to the third stage represented for us by the atomic age. In the first of these stages, Adam had to dig and Eve had to spin, for without this effort neither could continue to live. This is why practically everyone was an agricultural worker, and why such culture as there was was restricted to an extremely small minority, and why, for every one of the poets who wrote in Ancient Greece, there were hundreds of slaves. In the second stage machines came gradually to release men and women. For if one mechanical plough could work as fast as twenty men, nineteen men could be spared to receive education and culture. Without something of this kind our civilization could never have grown to be what it is. When we remember its many failings we ought also to remember that it is a vast improvement upon the first phase. But even this second phase is passing, as we enter the atomic age.

My reason for describing all this is that almost all this development has depended upon the availability of energy. It is just here that one aspect of our Christian responsibility begins to obtrude itself. There are three immediate reasons for this: (1) although the first phase was world-wide and universal, the second phase (of mechanization) is not, being chiefly confined to Western Europe and America. The underdeveloped countries are no longer satisfied with this situation and look to a standard of living comparable with ours. This requires energy, and capital, and the knowledge of how to use them. (2) The population of the world increases at the rate of about 80,000 each day; this

increase is chiefly in the very places where food and health and civilization are at their lowest. Even now we are using energy ten times as fast as we were using it a century ago, and it is estimated that if things go on as they are most likely to go, in another fifty years we shall need to use energy twenty times as fast as now. It is not difficult to see this, if we realize that our British consumption of power amounts to about forty times as much per head of the population as in underdeveloped countries like India and China. Yet without this power our factories could not work, our buses and our cars could not move, our homes would be cold and dark; we should be back in the Middle Ages. (3) The world's supplies of coal and oil are quite unequal to the task I have just been describing. At the enhanced rate predicted for the year A.D. 2000 the total world's supply of coal would only last a bare hundred years, and the world's oil supply a mere decade. Well might Professor Bhabha, the President of last year's United Nations' Conference for the peaceful uses of atomic energy, say: 'For the full industrialization of underdeveloped countries, for the continuance of our civilization and its further development, atomic energy is not merely an aid; it is an absolute necessity.'

One conclusion seems to me quite inescapable. If we believe that it is God's will that His children everywhere should enjoy the benefits of civilization, then we are committed to a fair and reasonable distribution of atomic energy. There are those who will argue that God is not concerned with these things. I shall reply that a pietistic attitude of that kind emasculates the Christian life of its struggle for goodness, and does despite to God's beneficence in making a richer life possible for all men. It is a denial of the worthwhileness and the significance of the material order. It fails to do justice to the real meaning of the Incarnation. Christians more than all others must be involved in these matters, if they are to be truly Christians.

This sort of responsibility is not easy to discharge. At least we can say that the atomic age will be exciting. For those who can come to the future with real elasticity of mind, these problems will be most stimulating and creative. Dealing with them is going to make life for our children immensely thrilling—full of glorious opportunities and of course at the same time magnificent dangers. We are all of us going to have to pass through a pretty searching experience before we can say that any of us is fit to live in the atomic age.

I have spoken of this as a Christian responsibility. But this prompts the question: is our responsibility for the right use of atomic energy different from our responsibility for the right use of any other scientific discovery? For the Christian, I do not see how the answer to this question can be other than 'no', since he must always see every action in the light of God's intention. If you live *sub specie aeternitatis*, then the right use of nuclear power is as significant a responsibility as the right use of money, or of time. But for the non-Christian, with whom, as Niebuhr continually reminds us, the Christian has to work in some sort of human compromise in nearly every sphere of human activity, the answer may be 'Yes'. For not only does the advent of nuclear power open for us the gates of new life; it equally well provides us with a destructive power vastly exceeding anything previously known. Here is the great tension—the close proximity of good and evil. In Winston Churchill's phrase, we have to learn to 'tread the rim of Hell'. For in its more refined form of nuclear

fusion, the hydrogen bomb may be used to obliterate instead of to build up. Here surely the Christian has something to say, some responsibility to discharge, to his fellows, Christian and non-Christian alike. For we know that this close companionship of wretchedness and greatness, fear and love, pity and hate, Heaven and Hell is of the very essence of God's creative purpose. Our warfare is not against flesh and blood, but against principalities and powers, and against the rulers of the darkness of this world. If it be true, in A. N. Whitehead's phrase, that the Kingdom of God is not so much the isolation of good from evil, but the overcoming of evil by good, then the Christian can look at those grave and sometimes terrifying prospects which I have been describing, and he can say: 'You need not fear. For the possibility of nuclear knowledge is a sign of God's providence, and our winning of this knowledge is a gift of God as though He would treat us no longer as spiritual babes, but as full-grown men and women. Here in this very crisis, is the material of victory, God's victory in us.' The Stoic might begin to talk like that, but only the Christian, who has companied with death, and found God deep in Hell, can really speak with conviction.

There is another aspect of this responsibility for nuclear knowledge which may lead the non-Christian to think of it more seriously than he is accustomed to think of other responsibilities. I am referring to the genetical dangers associated with atomic explosions. Here the essentials may be very briefly put, even though our detailed knowledge of certain numerical magnitudes is still not as full as we should like. It is universally agreed that a large part of our physical and mental characteristics, such as height, colour of hair, resistance to disease, are almost wholly determined by hereditary factors. These are found in the chromosomes of every living cell, and in the combination of male and female cells which leads to fertilization and the birth of a child both parents contribute equally. It is almost universally agreed that the chromosomes hold their hereditary influences in a series of genes, each of which governs one or more characteristic features. There are about 10-20,000 distinct genes in a human chromosome. From time to time one or more of these genes may be modified—we say that a mutation has occurred. Such mutations usually lead to a lowering of the stock, and the geneticists have shown convincingly that it is exceedingly dangerous to the human race for too many mutations to occur in any one generation. Now the radioactivity which results from every atomic explosion adds to this rate of mutation. Since this radioactivity dies away very slowly, we accumulate more and more of it all our lives; and since much of the products of an explosion is in the form of tiny dust particles, which go high into the atmosphere and very gradually settle on the earth almost universally, this danger cannot be localized.

The increase in background radiation in Britain and in Russia is less, but not vastly less, than in the United States. If we are not careful, we may do quite irreparable genetic damage. Even now, Professor Müller and others have estimated that within the next three generations we shall already have maimed or destroyed some 30,000 human beings: and the maximum effect due to explosions that have already occurred will not be experienced until something like the tenth generation. If the sins of the parents are thus to be visited upon the third and fourth generation, then it is surely time that someone cried:

'Halt'. It is probably true that in the long view of history, not a great deal of harm has been done—though 30,000 damaged or destroyed human lives can never be wholly disregarded—but it does seem to me that we, as Christians, have a solemn responsibility to act, in the Quaker phrase, 'for the unborn generations'. For the Christian does not live entirely in the present; in some sense he looks out upon the whole panorama of time, and his responsibilities accompany his gaze. We cannot abdicate our responsibility here, and leave it to the scientists, splendid as their tradition most undoubtedly is. The little limerick—

*There was a young girl from a mission
Who was seized by a dreadful suspicion
That original sin
Didn't matter a pin
In the era of nuclear fission*

describes a wholly unnecessary fear on the young girl's part. The great and searching questions bound up with our nuclear knowledge admit of no easy solutions, certainly of none that are not deeply religious.

The fact that our responsibility has this religious root is of first-rate importance. Failure to recognize it is one of the most potent reasons for the distrust in which the scientists are often held—as if they, and they alone, were responsible for opening Pandora's Box, and releasing upon an innocent world all the evils therein. There seem to me to be two main grounds for asserting the religious nature of our responsibility. The first is concerned with the nature of man, the second with our relationship to the material world. Let us consider them in turn.

If we were zoo-keepers, we should reckon that no satisfactory provision could be made for the various animals unless we knew something of their real nature. We should be foolish to build a paddling-pool for the giraffe or put a rack of hay for the lion. Yet many so-called scientific schemes for the supposed welfare of men are precisely of this kind. Put in other words this means that there are certain questions, not of a purely scientific character, which must be answered before we know how to use science properly. Many things will undoubtedly be altered in the atomic age, but some of the fundamental questions still remain. The Psalmist considered the heavens, and the moon and stars, and then he cried out: 'What is man that Thou art mindful of him?' But that was 1000 B.C. Today we think of civilization and its needs for energy, of atomic bombs and genetic damage, but we still cry out: 'What is Man?' I was reminded of this recently when I heard from the Bishop of Bristol of an incident that he witnessed on a London tram a few years ago. On this particular occasion he was sitting in one of these trams, and next to him there was a mother and her small boy. At one of the stopping-places there got on a City gentleman, complete with pin-stripe trousers, tightly-rolled umbrella, bowler hat, and spats. The child eyed this new arrival very suspiciously for a few moments and then, in that tone of voice that children reserve for specially important occasions, said: 'What's that man for, Mummie?' This is a question that belongs to every phase of human development; it is as old as man himself, and will be with us till the end of time. Without some understanding of its answer,

we shall never know how to use the knowledge of good and evil represented in the atom, as it should be used.

The revelation of God in Jesus Christ and among His Saints seems to me the only sure ground on which we may tread. Only in the light of that revelation of God do we see the true nature of man as a child of God, and begin to see how to deal with the moral and ethical problems raised by science. It was the leading article of one of our scientific journals, *Nature*, which underlined this recently when it said, speaking of some of the problems associated with atomic energy and world population:

The problem of relating action to knowledge and not to prejudice is a moral issue, in the sense that only a worthy view of man can compel the action, and induce men and women to accept the sacrifices which in one way or another will be demanded from the advanced, as well as from the underdeveloped, countries of the world.

Now where shall a worthy view of man be found? Without it all man's science and his skill go rotten. With it there opens out a life of splendid fulfilment, of joy and hope and deepest satisfaction. A worthy view of man—this is the one great problem for the atomic age. Its provision is one of the greatest contributions which we Christians can make to the world of the future.

My second ground for asserting the essentially religious implications of nuclear knowledge is concerned with our relationship to the material world. The Christian faith asserts that the whole universe belongs to God—"The earth is the Lord's and all the fulness thereof". Such is the burden of the first chapter of Genesis; and in the New Testament we learn of God's will to 'sum up all things in Christ, both things on earth and things in heaven'. The emphasis here is on things and not on people. We claim that the order of nature carries meaning, that the meaning may be discerned by anyone who looks in the right manner, and that this meaning is bound up with the nature of God. There is a very real truth, therefore, in the claim that God will not be fully known until He is found in a developed knowledge of the universe in which we live, and that therefore all true scientific study is a religious activity. Old John Ray in the seventeenth century could call science 'a proper study for a Sabbath day'. It is because of this material quality of the faith that I want to see the field of nuclear energy and its many ramifications claimed for Christ, not in any naïve manner, but recognizing that God's purposes of a full life for all His children cannot be fulfilled without it, and, no less, that in the search and the discovery some new facet of God's character and His being will be revealed. For there is something of God in the blinding flash of an atomic bomb and the great pillar of fire that is ten miles wide. The nuclear scientist may be—and is—one of God's messengers, but he is a messenger of flaming fire. The words of the Welsh poet, the late Dylan Thomas, have a relevance here: 'Oh, isn't life a terrible thing, thank God?' It most certainly is a terrible thing, if the Kingdoms of this earth are to become the Kingdoms of our God and His Christ. But we must also thank God for all the possibilities that nuclear knowledge has brought to help us in the task.

And now for the suggestions which seem to me to follow from all this. First,

let me say that I believe that the Christian Church should publicly and openly condemn all use of large-scale bomb explosions. We know too little about possible evil effects to take any risks, and if, as almost every ecumenical gathering has agreed, 'War is contrary to the mind of Jesus Christ', there can surely be little doubt about this. Let us do it, not because it is a way to get peace—which it may or may not be in present circumstances—but because it is an offence against the children of God to use a weapon of this type.

Next, let us intensify our sharing of the power provided by peaceful uses of nuclear knowledge. We ought to rejoice at all offers of nuclear fuel by rich nations to poorer ones.

At all events we must avoid the unseemly rush to buy up all available sources of uranium which has already started. Whatever happens the uranium is not ours—the Christian will see it as God's.

We should rejoice that there has been clearance of so much nuclear knowledge. Here at least the issue should be clear to those of us who are Christians. Knowledge cannot be nationalized, since it too is a gift of God. And as for nuclear knowledge, we should do well to remember that it is the combined work of many people in many countries that has led to the present situation. We are all debtors to Rutherford a New Zealander, Joliot a Frenchman, J. J. Thomson a Briton, Hahn a German, Kapitzka a Russian, Fermi an Italian, Bohr a Dane, Oppenheimer an American, Bhabha an Indian, as well as to many others; to Einstein a Jew and Cockcroft a Christian; to Madame Curie a woman and Becquerel a man.

Next, let us rejoice that other countries are designing atomic fuel plants, and let us begin to think how we can launch out in some great scheme to provide energy for all the less developed peoples of the world. Here indeed is a crusade in which all the nations of the world could unite. To be dominated by some really great enterprise, whose importance is recognized by all involved, is one of the surest ways to mutual understanding and fellowship. I should like the United Nations to discuss where new atomic stations should best be built, and how they might most easily be financed. I believe that projects of this kind, on a world scale, would do far more to establish good relations and ensure peace than interminable argument about the control of fissile material. For peace is a fruit, and fruit grows best when the tree is not too closely pruned by a crowd of rival gardeners!

Let us therefore dream great dreams. Let us imagine the use of atomic power to evaporate sea water, and transport it to irrigate central Australia; nothing else can do this. Let us imagine it blasting a way through ranges of mountains to water the arid parts of the western United States, so that the desert blossoms as the rose. Let us imagine it changing the climate of Siberia.

Much the same holds good in the biological sphere; for those very mutations whose existence in human genes is a cause of so much concern in nuclear explosions can be used to great advantage in agriculture. Cereals, when bombarded by neutrons in an atomic pile, experience mutations in large numbers. Most of these mutations are useless and actually weaken the stock; but a few are good. We can select these and so improve the stock; we can introduce new varieties altogether. Even now, in Britain, wheat, barley and oats have been treated; in America a fungus-free oat has already been produced; in Sweden

the most widely grown variety of white mustard has been obtained in such a way. Let us look to the time when we harvest crops beyond the Arctic Circle, and our control of biological techniques enables us to grow in each part of the world that which best fits there. Nothing less than this can cope with the rising world population and its demand for food.

In the field of medicine we have an even more striking situation. It may help us to see the scale in which medicine has been altered if I remind you that although radium has been mined extensively for some fifty years, the total weight produced is about ten pounds. The total stock used for medical purposes in Britain is about five ounces, and this is sufficient to treat several thousands of patients every year. Compare this situation with that which arises when we burn one single pound of uranium in a nuclear reactor; the fission products so produced have a long-lived radioactivity equivalent to about half a ton of radium. Let us rejoice again in the possibilities that all this raises for the curing of disease and the health of God's children in parts of the world where disease is rampant and health poor; and let us see that no one makes personal profit out of it to the detriment of its world-wide distribution. Bearing in mind what has happened with certain important drugs, there is need to take care.

You will see from what I have just said that I am profoundly grateful for our nuclear knowledge. This is not the fruit of some forbidden tree whose mortal taste must bring death and destruction into our world. Yet many people are afraid. The distinguished chemist, J. B. Conant of Harvard, in a recent series of lectures now printed, said 'I am afraid' of the future uses of atomic energy. Bertrand Russell said in a recent broadcast: 'I have found that the men who know most are the most gloomy.' Surely this need not be.

There are those who see these dangers, and go so far as to urge that we should stop all nuclear research and development in order to escape them. I am sure that such a policy would be a grievous sin; it would fortunately be impossible of achievement. Leonardo da Vinci could design a submarine and keep it from the public; Napier, the inventor of logarithms in the sixteenth century, could refuse to divulge the nature of a weapon that he had developed; Boyle, the chemist of the seventeenth century, could refuse to publish the ingredients of some poisons and a means of making ink invisible, as being 'mischievous'. But we can do nothing of this sort, and have to learn to live with the danger and the hope in nuclear knowledge. I remember how God said to Moses, as the children of Israel came near the end of their wandering journey: 'Go ye in and possess the land.' This is our call too. For He gave us this land, just as surely as He gave the land of Canaan to those early wanderers; and if we are brave enough and sensible and clear-minded enough to interpret His will in our new circumstances, we may discover that this Promised Land is rich with joy and fulfilment for all mankind. Only in that spirit can we hope to avoid the dangers and the temptation to unworthy ends.

On 18th July 1955, at West Milton, New York, Mr Lewis L. Strauss closed a giant two-way copper electric switch. Pushed one way, it could start an atomic submarine propulsion unit moving; pushed the other way, it could supply the first commercially available atomic power. 'This switch', Strauss remarked, 'is a symbol of the great dilemma of our times. I throw it now to the

side of the peaceful atom, and by that choice we mark the beginning of the scriptural injunction of Isaiah, "They shall beat their swords into ploughshares and their spears into pruning hooks". I do not know whether Mr Strauss, as he pressed that switch, thought of some earlier words of Pasteur, but they would have fitted very well with what he himself said.

Two opposing laws seem to me now in contest. The one a law of blood and death, opening out each day new modes of destruction, forces nations to be always ready for battle. The other, a law of peace, work and health, whose only aim is to deliver Man from the calamities that beset him. . . . Which of these two laws will prevail, God alone knows. But of this we may be sure, that science, in obeying the laws of humanity, will always labour to enlarge the frontiers of life.

I wish that I could be as sure of this conclusion as Pasteur was. But of this I am absolutely certain. It is our solemn Christian responsibility to see that the right law does prevail. For the only 'laws of humanity' which are truly binding are the laws of God.

C. A. COULSON

PROBLEMS OF CHURCH UNION (*Conclusion*)

What, then, is the way forward? To pray together, to think together, to preach together, to work together, and so to *grow* into one—to do everything together that our convictions do not compel us to do separately, that we may be built up into one temple of the Lord. And as that happens, there is no doubt at all that the Holy Spirit will indicate the practical steps that we are next to take to express and maintain the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.

RUPERT E. DAVIES

THE NATURE AND SPHERE OF CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

IT IS ONE of the temptations of a strongly evangelical Church like ours to mistake fever for fervour, to have misgivings when we are not boiling over, to suppose that we are doing the Lord's business only when we are battering at unbelievers with the mighty phrases of Scripture. This work we are, indeed, irrevocably pledged to do, and that high temperature is sometimes necessary for it. At this time in particular, when material aims are fascinating our fellows, we have not simply to say, but often to shout, that what matters most for a man is that he shall be saved.

Yet it does not follow that what matters most is all that matters. God requires of us other things besides the experience of the Cross. In the first place, He wants that experience to prove itself by passing into the discipline and duty of suitable deed. This calls for qualities of mind—knowledge of fact, reasoning power, quickness of decision—which the exercises of piety alone do not give. Secondly, He wants the saved to make, collectively, a difference to the structure and temper of society. This too demands of us something besides the potencies given to us in redemption. Many a good cause has foundered because its promoters were only good. When society was simple, righteous passion could stretch out its strong hand and itself do nearly all it wanted; today it must be humble enough to learn the effective ways through our labyrinths. Thirdly and lastly, God presumably wants the whole being of the redeemed, which implies that we are to develop, not for usefulness only, and not even for morality only, but also for other kinds of seemliness, the entire range of the natural capacities God has given us. We were obviously made to seek truth and beauty as well as goodness, to understand and admire Nature and not merely to exploit it, to take up with full hands the rich cultural achievement of the race and hand it on, with our own contributions, to the generations that are to spring up after us.

This I say not from Scripture but from experience, assuming, despite one current fashion, that theology and the plan of human conduct have to base themselves on both of these. It is plainly untrue to say, as some biblical theologians have been saying, that *everything* worth having is the direct gift of God's saving grace. St Paul did not receive on the way to Damascus the ability to read the Hebrew of the Old Testament or to write the current Greek; nor does the medical missionary get wholly from his faith the power to cleanse lepers and stamp out epidemics.

All this means that we need to be educated as well as saved. There is no impiety here. We are impious only when we deny either of those needs; or when we muddle them, seeking by the one what can be got only from the other.

This summary defence of education has foreshadowed the nature of it. We could define education as the sort of human improvement that can be carried out by human effort; and we would understand by 'human improvement' the development of the whole man so as to make it commensurate with his whole environment.

What, then, is *Christian* education? Is it something narrower, or wider? Is it education with a minus, or with a plus? The above line of approach moves us to the second alternative. Christian education is all good secular education enriched with an enlarged view of the whole man and his whole environment. It is all sustained training made magnificent by the Old Testament's superb picture of the universe, and by the New Testament's sunlit and storm-wracked revelation of God in Christ; by the Old Testament's demand for social and personal righteousness, and by the New Testament's astonishing call to and offer of a life even higher than that of righteousness. The result of Christian education would be the natural man naturally cleansed and expanded, all lifted up to meet, and be further cleansed and expanded by, the supernatural grace of God. And the sphere of Christian education would be everything that helps toward that result.

So much for the grand generalities of our theme. Since we are met to try to discern our duties and opportunities within the contemporary scene, my question must be: 'What can our own Church do to spread Christian education in that wide sense?'

The big fact we are faced with is that in more and more countries the responsibility for educating youngsters is being taken over by the State. So far as this is a recognition that the minds of children and youth are the concern of the whole community, it is an advance; and anyhow, when all a nation's younger end is to be put to school, only the State can bear the expense. This does not, however, necessitate our complete withdrawal from a field which has long been the Church's special sphere of action. Several ways are open. (1) The Churches may continue to run some schools themselves, as they do in England. (2) As corporate bodies, they can make an impact on State policy and administration. (3) They can help in the training of teachers for State schools by maintaining Teachers' Training Colleges, as they do in England. (4) Our Church members, as citizens and parents, can and should make their influence felt.

Of these possibilities I shall single out the third, on the ground that it is the teachers who, after the parents, most determine the quality of a school. Here, I believe, is one of our greatest contemporary opportunities.

In Britain religious instruction is compulsory (with an escape-clause for conscience), but the requirement limps because only a small proportion of our teachers, even of those who are religious, are competent to carry it out on the scale and at the level prescribed by our Education Act. The Education Authorities are trying to improve matters by organizing special courses, for which they invite the co-operation of the Churches; and the Education Department of our own Church has encouraged the formation of regional Methodist Teachers' Associations.

But we need to go further than religious instruction in the stricter sense. If our ambition is to turn education into Christian education, our task is to see that at least those teachers who belong to our Churches are shown how to do all their teaching with the Christian outlook and in the Christian spirit.

This is not easy. In principle, the answer may be: 'Save the teachers, and the rest will follow.' In fact, the rest does not follow: we have many saved teachers who do not know how to infuse the Christian purpose and values into their teaching of the non-religious subjects.

Their first difficulty is a scruple. The teacher who has a professional conscience rightly believes that education is one thing and propaganda another. Religious instruction, he would say, is an honest affair, but 'dragging religion in' to other subjects of instruction looks like a professional crime. Having learned in college that each subject must be studied and taught by its own standards, he fears that intellectual clearness and objective truth can be violated, in both teacher and taught, when any and every subject is turned into a tool for religious propaganda.

We must respect this scruple, and stand by the teacher who insists that, for instance, a geography lesson should remain a geography lesson, that is, an exercise in how to think of this richly patterned crust of earth, and of the ways in which man's life is related to it. Any skimpiness or waffling here, any dodging of natural facts and problems in order to leave time for an easy diversion into the supernatural, would be professionally shocking. Whatever is taught must be taught in its own terms, and as thoroughly as the time of the lesson and the capacity of the pupils allow. The religious zeal of the Christian teacher gives him no dispensation from this professional code, no authority to shorten or twist a secular subject in order to get in his pieties.

Nevertheless, the ideal of a Christian education must be pressed. The professional scruple can be met, subject to two conditions. First, the Christian teacher is free to put in the extra that belongs to him as a Christian provided that in doing so he neither scamps nor distorts his subjects. When he has dealt with these well by their own standards, he can properly set them in a large context, and there expose them, in the Christian perspective, to Christian judgement. Secondly, this enlargement and heightening of reference can be done in a way that is not propaganda in the bad sense of this term: in varying degrees, according to the capacity of the pupils, it can stretch the reasoning powers, expand the imagination, exercise the sensibility, bring different subjects face to face, and make them all face life. That would be teaching. It would be a queer form of freedom if, in a Christian land, a teacher were entirely forbidden to make his pupils aware of the Christian interpretation of Nature, of history, and of social and individual life. Indeed, to teach nothing but uninterpreted facts would be a queer form of education.

By what steps is the teacher to move educatively from any one of the usual school-subjects to the height or depth at which he is forced to bring out the great questions that send us to religion for their answering? This is the teacher's second difficulty, one of method, on which I can only say that we need a group of Christian experts to think out some practical hints and illustrations.

This ideal of Christian education is, of course, too big to be fully realized in the schools. But the same is true of any ideal of education. The schools can take only the first few steps on the long road to the perfect. Yet even in those first steps the Christian ideal can be operative. To give a few simple examples: this ideal is bound to condemn any course on English literature that excludes its most splendid monument, the Authorized Version of the Bible, on the ground that it happens to be religious; or a course on history that brings religion in only as a cause of quarrels between popes and emperors, bishops and kings, Protestants and Romanists; or a course on human geography that fails to note the distribution of religions, or barely notes it without saying what sorts of

life they carry with them. The Christian teacher will not be able to go through the past with nothing but a muck-rake, or make his comments on events and persons smart or cynical. If he touches on science, he will show a respect for the strenuous thinkers and for the marvellous world they are doing their best to understand. Here is no propaganda, no falling short of the standards of teaching, but a setting of standards, by calling young minds to a proportioned view of the world and to fair and clean attitudes toward it.

Finally, the educative task needs to be extended beyond the schools to the adult members of our Churches. We who are adult should be better able to influence the education of children if we continued our own. But think for the present only of the religious aspect. We have Sunday-schools for training children in the Faith. What have we for training our adult members? Is their idea of God big enough to evoke utter worship, and to encourage them in long meditation? Do they know their way through the Bible, and can they read it with wholehearted devotion and wholeminded understanding? Are they able to explain and defend their Faith? Is their grasp of Christian moral principle clear and firm enough to enable them to apply it to the practical problems of their own, their family's and their nation's life? Can we leave them with a grown-up knowledge of some things and little more than a child's knowledge of religion? Are we to accept the dilemma of either too great a mental gap between the pulpit and the pew, or the dropping of the level of pulpit exposition to a low level of religious understanding in the pew?

Adult religious education is needed to make us fitter dwelling places of the Holy Spirit and better instruments for His work in the world. We Methodists have little excuse for undervaluing this task, seeing that John Wesley spent nearly as much of his prodigious energy teaching his people as preaching to them. He was one of the most tireless and powerful educators of modern times. We have inherited his mantle.

Allow me to close with some words I wrote for last year's Education Sunday: 'Thank God for your own education, and repent if you have not continued it. Remember the school-children, especially those who are handicapped in any way; the college and university students, who are training for the higher social responsibilities; and the teachers, to whom you have committed these precious souls. And pray that the entire educational enterprise, from the framing of the legislation for it down to the contact of teachers with taught, may be so cleanly done that the Spirit of God can easily come into it and complete its work.'

T. E. JESSOP

THE BIBLE IN EDUCATION

I

COULD there be any easier subject to talk about than this? 'The Bible in Education' surely means picking out the stories of the Old Testament heroes or the parables of Jesus and telling them all over again at much greater length in your own words. Or it consists of choosing a biblical text, perhaps from a Christmas card or a calendar, and illustrating it up to date from the pages of the *Sunday Companion* or the *Upper Room*. What could be more simple?

There are many people who do exactly this and believe that thereby they have brought the Bible into education. I suggest, however, that this is not Bible-study at all. It may, of course, entertain small children or edify easy-going adults, but there is in it respect neither for the ancient biblical writers nor for the minds of the modern readers.

I want therefore this evening to offer a few considerations on the real nature of education and the real place of the Bible in it.

First of all, then, we are to notice that education is a process in two stages. We begin by being concerned chiefly with the learner—his background, his experience, his age, his ability—and we adapt our teaching to *him*. We begin, that is to say, with what we might call the psychological approach. Some people, I am sorry to say, never get beyond this, and even when they are dealing with adults or teen-agers they continue to put the learner in the centre of the picture. 'The child in the midst' is one of those slogans that have bedevilled education, particularly in our time. We may begin with him in the midst, but the time comes when the subject has to be put in the midst and the learner has to adapt himself to it rather than the other way round. This is the second stage of education.

Let me explain what I mean from an experience of my own. When I was a boy I came across a book called *An Elementary Text Book of Physics*, by J. C. P. Aldous. It was most exciting, and told me all that I wanted to know about clocks and locks, steam-engines, magnets, search-lights and electric batteries. It was great fun and there was not a single mathematical equation in it.

But it was not really physics. It was the raw material out of which the science of physics could be made. But in order to make it, you had to impose on all this material a principle of arrangement and classification which came to you from elsewhere and was not provided by the learner at all. And that meant imposing a discipline upon yourself. You have to put in the centre of things, not the learner's mind, but the subject as an organized whole. For the psychological approach you substitute the logical.

But note what happens. The two are neither alternatives nor are they in opposition. The fun which you enjoy at the beginning of your study comes back again ten-fold because you have been willing for the time being to lose it. That, if you like, is a paradox. To lose in order to gain. The Bible itself says something about that. If you are not willing to lose, if you feel that you must be entertained *all* the time, that you must never, never do any drudgery, you will never gain that deeper enjoyment of which I am speaking.

This I believe to be true of education in any subject whatsoever, including Scripture. The child is in the midst for only a limited time. It is when he stays

there too long that we get the necessity for such books as Joan Dunn's *Retreat from Learning* or Hilda Neatby's *So Little for the Mind*. But we do make a beginning from the child's point of view.

II

Let us therefore begin with the Bible and the child's point of view. What is it?

In the first place it involves a disappearance of the distinction between the seen and the unseen, between the natural and the supernatural. To a child they are both the same thing, just as they are with primitive people everywhere. We may bring Wordsworth into the witness-box to testify:

*There was a time when meadow, grove, and stream,
The earth, and every common sight,
To me did seem
Apparelled in celestial light,
The glory and the freshness of a dream.*

Let me follow this up with a story.

A small boy used to be taken to school by his mother. The school lay on the other side of the street, and so she always crossed over with him. On the return journey he had to wait for her to bring him back again. One afternoon, however, when she arrived at the accustomed point she found him already on her side of the road. She scolded him and asked him why he had done it. He said: 'God told me to.' This puzzled her exceedingly, but a passer-by enlightened her. The little boy was waiting, as instructed, on his side of the road when a police car drew up, stopped, and the policeman said through the loudspeaker: 'Little boy, you may cross now.' And so he crossed.

There you have it. Children think of God like that and the biblical writers thought of God like that. They spoke about Him and to Him with just that same easy assurance shown by that little boy. If there was 'the sound of a going in the tops of the mulberry trees' that was God going before them into battle. If the almond rod blossomed it was a sign from God. The thunder of a volcano was God's voice. If, marvellous to relate, their forefathers had been delivered from slavery in Egypt it was God who did it. They could not see Him, but his 'mighty acts' showed that He was there. And so they handed down to later ages stories about Him such as Abraham's discussion with God about Sodom and Jeremiah's call to be a prophet. They expressed it all in that vivid graphic form that children use. And that is why the young child finds no difficulty in accepting the Old Testament. He is nearer to it than you are. Things which are problems to you are not problems to him. He *expects* God to say things and do things and be interested in things.

In the second place, the child's point of view is characterized by that element which some people call atmosphere, others intuition, but for which the best name is 'the numinous'. This is that sense of wonder and of awe which is at the very heart of all religion. It is emphasized by silence rather than by talk and is produced by suggestion rather than by expression. It is an inwardness which is spoiled by all attempts at outwardness. You may have noticed the embarrassment of a child and the irritation of an adult when a second person breaks in upon their enjoyment of a thrill with the fatuous remark: 'Are you enjoying it?'

Expression and suggestion—how far is the one removed from the other! Here is the danger of visual aids. They clamp a certain association on an idea or on a person or on an experience and that association is for ever fixed. Have you ever seen an edition of *Alice in Wonderland* illustrated by someone other than Tenniel? And have you felt it to be somehow *wrong*? That is because Tenniel's pictures got in first and we accept his picture of the Mad Hatter or the Duchess as the only true and authentic representations. It is because of this habit of mind that I abhor all pictures of Christ, whether by Sallman or Leonardo da Vinci or anybody. I believe it was in the providence of God that no one should ever know what Jesus was like.

Now the child is extremely suggestible to atmosphere and there are several ways of producing it without causing self-consciousness.

One way in which I myself strongly believe is by hearing the words of Scripture *well read*. I don't mean read dramatically—that is where actors so often fall down when reciting Scripture—but read carefully so that each word is heard with its proper emphasis. Here is the value of what we call 'purple passages' and the Bible is full of them. Take Psalm 23, for instance, or Isaiah, Chapters 35, 53, and 55, or Jeremiah 31, verses 31 to 34, or any of the parables of Jesus. And what of those glorious concluding chapters of Job—for a child a real visit to the zoo? Here are the lion, wild goat, wild ass, peacock, ostrich, horse ('He saith among the trumpets "ha, ha" and he smelleth the battle afar off'), eagle, hippopotamus, and no less than thirty-four verses on the crocodile!

A second way of producing this appreciation of biblical literature is by the choice of certain passages that are characteristic of the Hebrew idiom in their use of repetition. Give a grown-up to read verses 20 to 23 in Genesis 18, and see what he will make of them. It is the story of Abraham pleading on behalf of Sodom:

Wilt thou also destroy the righteous with the wicked? Peradventure there be fifty righteous in the city: wilt thou also destroy and not spare the place for the fifty? And the Lord said, If I find in Sodom fifty righteous within the city, then I will spare all the place for their sakes.

Abraham then feels that he might have got an even better bargain, so he asks the Lord to spare it even for forty-five. Then forty, thirty, twenty, and finally only ten.

I will not destroy it for ten's sake.

For an adult all this is somewhat wearisome to read and he is apt to hurry it on. But children, like the biblical writers, do not like to be hurried on, and all this repetition is a keen source of enjoyment.

Perhaps there is an even better example in Daniel 3. Note how it begins:

Nebuchadnezzar the king made an image of gold, whose height was threescore cubits, and the breadth thereof six cubits: he set it up in the plain of Dura, in the province of Babylon. . . . Then an herald cried aloud, To you it is commanded, O people, nations, and languages, that at what time ye hear the sound of the cornet, flute, harp, sackbut, psaltery, dulcimer, and all kinds of musick, ye fall down and worship the golden image that Nebuchadnezzar the king hath set up.

And this whole catalogue (though not quite all of it, as you will see if you look it up) is repeated three more times, so that you can sympathize with the preacher who simply said: 'Brass band as before.' But this is the very sort of story out of which children get so much enjoyment and you must not deprive them of it by slurring over it.

But I was talking of purple passages. The Old Testament has no monopoly of them. Listen to this.

Behold, I show you a mystery; We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed.

For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality.

So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, *then* shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, *Death is swallowed up in victory.*

Now, of course, this raises the question, Is it not necessary that they should understand what they are reading? To which the answer is *No*. The meaning of these passages may be beyond them, but we are not reading them for the meaning but for the sake of the music. And here comes in a cunning little factor in human psychology. The power to learn by heart is at its greatest in childhood and it begins to diminish some time after the age of 20. Accordingly we let the child hear all these wonderful passages over and over again and he will have no trouble in committing them to memory, for he will be doing that unconsciously all the time. Then when he is older and the time for understanding has come he will have a whole lot of biblical material that is his very own and which he can now reinterpret.

My elder daughter when she was about six was in our sitting-room looking out on a lawn that had been very badly drained. It had been raining and the water had not run away. She was overheard saying over and over again to herself: 'And the parched ground shall become a pool and the thirsty land springs of water.' Here was prophecy being fulfilled before her very eyes!

III

And now let us leave the beginning and the psychological approach and come on to stage two—the older student, the law of the subject itself, and the logical approach. Where do we begin now?

Before beginning anywhere there are certain preliminary considerations to be borne in mind.

First of all we must remember that the Bible is an ancient book and it exhibits ancient habits of mind.

For instance, there was no such thing as copyright. Who was King Lemuel? No one knows, but he managed to gain immortality through his aphorisms about the virtuous woman whose price is above rubies being tacked on to the Book of Proverbs and so he sheltered under the great name of Solomon. All the ancients were free and easy in this way with documents. An unknown writer has added the second half of a book called by the name of Isaiah. Someone else

has added another character in the story in the middle of the Book of Job, and Deuteronomy begins with a long introduction added by a later hand. There was nothing dishonest about it. It is the sort of thing we do ourselves when an unknown author gets a friend with a well-known name to write a preface to his book.

Then they did not understand collation—that is to say the blending of various sources to form a coherent whole. The man, for instance, who wrote the Book of Genesis in the form in which we now have it, found ready to his hand two quite separate stories of the Creation. Where a modern writer would try to 'collate' them into one, the ancient writer put them both in and left it to the reader to sort them out.

They were unfamiliar with secondary causes. Anything that they could not understand was put down to the direct action of God. If Pharaoh's heart was unreasonably hard it must be because God made it so. If Pharaoh was miraculously drowned God must have meant that as a punishment because his heart was hard. This was a very ancient habit of mind. Tertullian complained later that every untoward event was put down to the Christians as the simplest explanation possible. If the Nile overflowed, it was because of the Christians. If it dried up, that also was due to the Christians. And how many of our own contemporaries find the easiest explanation of labour troubles in the existence of what they call 'paid agitators'?

These are a few points that are characteristic of all ancient literature. There are, however, others that are peculiar to the Bible. It is well to remember, for instance, that the histories *as we have them* were written under the influence of the prophets. Accordingly, since kingship in Israel had proved to be a disaster, it was natural to blame the first of that unfortunate series, namely King Saul. Poor Saul could do nothing that was right. The prophetic writers saw to that. Again, the obelisk of Shalmanaser, king of Assyria, refers to Israel as 'the land of Omri'. But Omri had been dead for half a century. Yet this great king, who to Assyrian eyes was the greatest Israel had ever had, gets only three verses in I Kings because the prophetic writers did not like him since in their eyes he was a sinner. The writers of the Old Testament histories wrote history as Dr Johnson wrote his reports of Parliament, when he 'took care to see that the Whig dogs should not have the best of it!'

It is worth remembering also that all the Pauline Epistles were written before the Gospels, and that Jesus was believed to be 'the first-born of all creation', 'He in whom all things consist,' long before He was handed down to history by His enemies as 'a man gluttonous, a winebibber, a friend of publicans and sinners'. (That, by the way, is about the greatest proof you could have of the authenticity of the Gospels.)

What all this amounts to is that when you get to the stage of real Bible study you begin in the Old Testament not with Genesis but with Amos, and in the New Testament not with the Gospels but with Acts and First and Second Corinthians.

Then there is the question of contexts. The history of Israel was determined by its relations to five great empires in succession—Assyria, Babylon, Persia, Greece, and Rome. The development of the Gospel was largely affected by the existence of its rival—the worship of the Emperor. Accordingly, the contexts

of both Old and New Testaments are vital for a clear understanding of the biblical narrative.

Take for instance that wonderful section in the second chapter of Philippians which begins 'Have this mind in you, which was also in Christ Jesus' and ends: 'that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord.' Notice how that word 'Lord' comes as a climax at the very end of a wonderful description of Christ. Why?

Philippi was a garrison town and at that period a favourite subject of gossip among the troops was the persistence of Nero and Caligula to get the Senate to give them the oriental title 'Lord' (*Kyrios*). Julius Caesar and Augustus had been content with the simple adjective '*divus*' (divine), but their successors wanted the title of Divinity itself. To the Christians among the soldiers this letter from Paul is delivered and they note how it takes up this very theme. But notice how Paul deals with it! Not the arrogant Caesar but the humble Jesus *is given*—not demands—'the name that is above every name'.

Accordingly if we are going to put the Bible into higher education we need to ask who were the biblical writers, when did they write, what were their circumstances, why did they write, and what did the people understand by the message to whom it came first?

IV

I have spoken about education being a continual process of reinterpretation. We learn a little, then we go back to the beginning and look at it in the light of what we have learned since. And this process is continually going on, so that education is not so much the mere accumulation of fresh facts as the acquiring of a deeper insight into the facts that are there already. A few illustrations will make clear what this means.

Let us look afresh for instance, at the story of David and Goliath, which all children know. It is a good story well written, and it is often told merely as a kind of variation of Jack-the-Giant-Killer. But this invasion of Israel by the Philistines was a serious business for Israel. It might easily have meant the end of the nation. And so we are not surprised to find hesitation and fear on the part of Saul and all his warriors. While they are in this mood David meets them, and although he is but a shepherd lad the really important factor in the story is his wholly unexpected reaction to this situation: 'Who is this uncircumcised Philistine that he should defy the armies of the living God?'

During the darkest days of the late war, when France had fallen and it looked as if Britain might fall too, we were tremendously encouraged by Churchill, who never at any time entertained the idea of Britain's defeat. Isaiah 36 and 37, paralleled in II Kings 18 and 19, deals with a similar situation. The arrogant Assyrian has been carrying all before him and now little Israel stands in his path. He is as contemptuous of Israel as of a fly on the wall. King Hezekiah is terribly afraid and worried, and no wonder! So he asks advice of Isaiah, then a prominent member of the Israelitish foreign office, and what reply does he get concerning Assyria?—

This is the word which the Lord hath spoken concerning him; . . . Whom hast thou reproached and blasphemed? and lifted up thine eyes on high? even against the Holy

One of Israel. . . . But I know thy sitting down, and thy going out, and thy coming in . . . therefore will I put my hook in thy nose . . . and I will turn thee back by the way by which thou camest.

That if you like is the Churchillian touch—but it was the prophetic touch. And after that you are not surprised to read the laconic words of the chronicler that 'when men arose early in the morning' the Assyrians 'were all dead corpses'.

My last illustration concerns a very popular subject nowadays, namely psychology. My old doctor once told me that all the psychology anybody needed to know was in the Bible if they knew where to look for it. May I mention briefly five psychological problems which affect us in these times?

First the problem of love and hate. Curiously enough they have the same root, and if you want a modern treatment of the subject you can get it in Ian Suttie's notable book *The Origins of Love and Hate*. But take this grim story in II Samuel 13 about David's villainous son Amnon who seduced his fair sister Tamar. It concludes with these words of keen insight. 'Then Amnon hated her with exceeding great hatred; for the hatred wherewith he hated her was greater than the love wherewith he had loved her.' There you have an insight into the darker side of human life which nowadays we often imagine is known only to the psychiatrist.

Secondly, there is the ever-present factor of conflict—the commonest experience of mankind. There is no more pregnant word of Jesus than this: 'No man can serve two masters.' The significance of His own temptation was that it was a choice between two alternative means of achieving a good end. To Him, however, it was more than that—it was a conflict of loyalties, and it could only be resolved by worshipping God and serving Him. The Old Testament is full of the same idea. 'Choose this day whom ye will serve', says Elijah. The story of Samson is that of a man who tried to keep alive two conflicting loyalties and 'he wist not that the Lord had departed from him'. See how Milton deals with Samson's conflict and see also the way in which Browning deals with that of Saul.

Thirdly, there is analysis. For those who strive after goodness, temptation continually comes at a higher level. But did any psychiatrist ever give a more subtle analysis of the spirit of man than Paul gave in the seventh chapter of Romans? It is a warning that temptation never ends, and to my mind this is a truer analysis of sainthood than any doctrine or theory of perfection.

Then there is judgement. It is a well-known fact of human psychology that before a man can accept forgiveness he must first of all accept judgement. And what is it that makes a man judge himself if it is not the spirit of God? The Gospel of John continually dwells upon this theme and is indeed a commentary on the text in Hebrews: 'The word of God is quick and powerful and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit and of the joints and marrow, and is a discernor of the thoughts and intents of the heart.' There is psychoanalysis for you, and there is your justification for confronting men with Christ.

Lastly there is synthesis. The real weakness of Freudian psychoanalysis is that it is negative. It stops with analysis, and the condition of a man who has submitted to this very painful process and is left alone in it, is of all situations

most pitiable. But synthesis is a different process from analysis and needs a different approach altogether. Paul knew that, and he saw that only in a fully committed loyalty was there any hope for mankind. And so he says: 'If any man is in Christ, he is a new creature: the old things are passed away; behold, they are become new.'

V

There is one final word I wish to say about the Bible in education. We are greatly exercised nowadays with the meaning of history. What is the purpose of our life upon this earth? Looking back, can we see any leading idea that has been persistent through the ages? Looking forward, can we see any principle that makes for survival? What is the key to human destiny?

This was the very problem which beset the mind of the author of the Book of Revelation. It is not a very Christian book, except for its main theme, and its interpretation has been the playground of cranks of all sorts. But the theme is really quite simple and it gives the answer to our own present-day problems as well as those of the time of the author.

In effect it is this. There are two warfares—one in heaven and one on earth. Both of them are against evil—the evil Roman empire on earth and the evil principle in the spiritual world. These are vitally connected, and success in the one is the guarantee of success in the other. As the angels of God overcome Satan so the Christians will overcome Rome. As the Christians are faithful in their struggle against Rome so they strike a blow against evil in the heavenly places. But what is the sign of ultimate victory? Not a symbol of power, no military expression of the sovereignty of God. No. But a lamb with its throat cut—the most astonishing image that has ever taken possession of the human mind. Here, however, is the key to history. 'Thou art worthy to take the book and open the seals thereof.' It is innocence, gentleness and suffering that will win ultimate victory. 'Worthy is the lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing.' This is the meaning of the whole cosmic process as well as of the Bible. The Old Testament story centres round the paschal lamb. The New Testament centres round Calvary. Power, force, violence and war have no ultimate survival value and no seed of permanence. Only in the Cross do we see the plan of the ages.

A. VICTOR MURRAY

DARK NIGHT AND RADIANT DAY

I

*And is this then the Dark Night I must learn?
This hour of the unanswered cry? I call
Upon my ghostly King to slay and fall
Heavy upon my wrong, rather than turn
His Care's apparency away! In vain
I beat against His door, His making power
Moves not, redemptive, in this barren hour,
Nor will, save I, contrite, repent pride's stain.*

*I wait upon His Logos; all unwise,
Possessed of craft but not of prophecy,
I may record His moving (if in me
He choose to move)—else I soliloquize
And by the graceless measures of my verse
Sense on me still the old Adamic curse.*

II

*Out of these depths, Lord, out of these deeps
What green deliverance? What ultimate rescue?
O daily I fail and fall on my path, nor sleeps
The serpent conscience. Save Thee what true
Hope have I of ransom? What prospect of white
Morning after this dark of loss and denial?
How shall I quell quick-tongued, Christ-lacking spite?
Walk innocent with God, acquitted after trial?*

*Out of these griefs where even Love is turned
To barbed minutes tearing my tempted flesh,
O I have called upon Thee, Sufferer, spurned
Among men! Glorious now! O Christ, enmesh,
O pluck me from this wilderness! O rare
Saviour, my temporal ravages repair!*

III

*Who shall heal, haven and hold us? Who
Shall mould and make us new? fashion afresh
The shape and colour of earth? Who shall enmesh
Our hearts in his net of care? O who shall sue
Our souls before Love's Judge? Who shall come, bold,
And win in fresh rapture hearts ere this broken?
Who shall, Divine Coiner, take our baser token
And render back new guilders of gold?*

*None save that visiting Grace, under the moon
Moving in mercy through our deeds and days:
None save that Fons et Origo who stays
Constant when all else shifts and shatters. None
O none, save our Man of Mercies holds and heals,
The wound washes clean, the oozing lifeblood seals.*

IV

*In the beginning was the making Word,
The power proceeding that shaped star and sun,
So that no single, quickening atom stirred
But by His engendering Will, nor any one
Of all the multitudinous stars began
To light eternity. By His shaping hand
Was rock and ocean and the silent land
Brought from first Chaos to be home of man.*

*In the beginning was Love, and since He made
Our answering hearts to know Him and return
Some scruple of that care, we are afraid,
Lonely and lost, unless, simple, we learn
To answer His need of us: When Love's obeyed
We are no more in loss and guilt and blame,
But sons and praisers of Love's holy name.*

V

*Since first world was, was the eternal light
Moving to grace and compassion
The infant heart of man. Not one poor wight
But had in him something of Love's high fashion.
Since first Love was, was the eternal grace
Moving in mercy through the grieving days
Of countless wakening souls. A hundred creeds
Sought comfort and salvation to embrace.*

*Then in a moment of most mountainous power
The Word descended, and the Word was born
A child among us, simple, for that hour
Growing like us to childhood's wonder. Shorn
Of creation's majesty, the Son of Man
Took on our flesh, our loss, our little span.*

FREDERIC VANSON

JAMES HERVEY, METHODIST PROSE POET

ON 14th June 1746, the Reverend Richard Pearsall, Independent Minister at Warminster, wrote thus to the great Dr Philip Doddridge:

This week I have been surprised by a book which fell into my hands, entitled *Meditations upon the Tombs and on a Flower Garden*, by James Hervey, A.B. I have been charmed with the lively images, striking expressions, and serious piety which I find there. I wondered much to see a young clergyman acquainted so much with the genius of the gospel, and animated with such a warm love to his Redeemer. Pray, dear Sir, do you know who and where he is? Not that I think the question will be needed to be asked long if he goes on to publish. Whoever he is, methinks I cannot but love and admire him.

Pearsall's surprise at finding a pious young clergyman can perhaps be pardoned during the first half of the eighteenth century. Already, however, the leaven of Methodism was spreading into many country parishes, and into city pulpits too. Even that celebrated Nonconformist Dr Doddridge could acknowledge its value, and enter into a friendly correspondence with John Wesley. And James Hervey was a Methodist. Samuel Richardson, author-printer, through whose press *Meditations upon the Tombs* had been ushered into the world, confessed: 'I think him inclined to the enthusiastic part of Methodism.' Hervey's birthplace and his home at this time were both within a few miles of Doddridge's Academy at Northampton, so that Pearsall's thirst for information could speedily be quenched.

Born into a clergyman's family in 1714, James Hervey was sent on from Northampton Grammar School to Lincoln College, Oxford. Here his tutor was Richard Hutchins, Fellow and Rector of the College—and an Oxford Methodist. A more famous Fellow of Lincoln, John Wesley, took the youth under his wing, encouraging him to study Hebrew and introducing him to the meetings of the Holy Club shortly before George Whitefield joined the group. In later years Hervey was to acknowledge his debt to Wesley: 'I can never forget the tender-hearted and generous Fellow of Lincoln, who condescended to take such compassionate notice of a poor undergraduate, whom almost everybody condemned, and when no man cared for my soul.' In 1736 Hervey was ordained deacon, his first curacy being under yet another Oxford Methodist, Charles Kinchin, Rector of Dummer. His poor health soon compelled him to retire to the hospitality of Paul Orchard's home at Bideford, where he continued to preach a little, especially for George Thompson, the evangelical Vicar of St Gennys, whom Mark Guy Pearse called 'the first Cornish Methodist'. Ordained priest in 1739, in the following year Hervey became Curate of Bideford. Here he remained till 1743, planning and partly writing the first two of the devotional essays which were to make him famous, the second being dedicated to one of Thompson's daughters. From Bideford he returned to Weston Favell to become his father's curate, succeeding to the living on his father's death in 1752, and holding it for the six remaining years of his own short life.

Whilst the first steps of Hervey's spiritual pilgrimage were taken amongst the Methodists, he soon found that his call was mainly to the work of a zealous

paris
atten
cours
wide
be in
bekn
mini
As
appa
micro
pictu
'acco
divin
to 'a
best
serio
than
No
whic
Bide
and i
our t
with
thus
on a
Hi
in th
Edw
sent
pleas
inste
piece
to di
Noti
and
appr
Robe
Th
parti
temp
unsu
... A
draw
of ju
Th
litera
seen
theol

parish priest, distributing clothes, tracts, and good advice, and securing medical attention for those under his care. He strongly urged Wesley to follow a similar course at Oxford: 'Is greater perfection to be attained by wandering into the wide world, and preaching in variety of places? Or will this way of preaching be more successful and efficacious? I cannot bring myself to believe this.' Unbeknown to himself, however, he was far to outstep parish bounds in his own ministry, by printing, if not by preaching.

As a young Oxford undergraduate the Methodist zeal for learning had apparently turned him towards scientific studies, and as a country curate the microscope was seldom off his study table. *Theron and Aspasio* contains his picture of an ideal study, decorated with busts and engravings, its shelves 'accommodated, not encumbered' with books on history, science, poetry, and divinity. Prominent also were the terrestrial and celestial globes, in addition to 'a large reflecting telescope; and on the top of a bureau, one or two of the best microscopes'. In a footnote Hervey pleads: 'Gentlemen of taste and seriousness cannot, I think, have a nobler piece of furniture for their studies, than the microscope and the telescope, the orrery and the air-pump.'

Nor was polite literature neglected. The leisurely moralizings of the *Spectator* which so much influenced his own writings, he perused again and again. From Bideford Hervey wrote to his sister: 'We read one or more of these elegant and instructive papers every morning at breakfast, and they are served up with our tea, according to their original design. We reckon our repast imperfect without a little of Mr Addison's or Mr Steele's company.' A *Spectator* essay, thus discussed over a cup of tea, gave Hervey the germ idea of his *Reflections on a Flower-Garden*, as well as providing its motto.

His main poetic inspiration was Milton's *Paradise Lost*—'the sublimest poem in the world'—whilst a good second was the *Night Thoughts* of his contemporary Edward Young, under whose spell he had fallen as a youth of twenty, when he sent his sister Young's *Last Day* with the request: 'If therefore you would please yourself, refine your taste, or have the practice of religion pleasing, instead of plays, ballads, and other corrupt writings, read this almost divine piece of poetry; read it (as I have done) over and over, think upon it, endeavour to digest it thoroughly, and even to get by heart the most moving passages.' Noticeable also in Hervey's work is the influence of Pope, of Prior's *Solomon*, and of Thomson's *Seasons*, whilst in *Meditations upon the Tombs* he quotes approvingly the recently-published masterpiece of the mortuary school of poets, Robert Blair's *Grave*.

The classics also exercised a strong influence on Hervey's mind, Virgil in particular, from whom he quotes a score of times in *Meditations and Contemplations*, a total exceeded only by Milton. In 1746, however, he decided—unsuccessfully—to banish his classics in favour of the Bible: 'Away, my Homer! . . . Away, my Horace! . . . And even my prime favourite, my Virgil, may withdraw; since, in Isaiah, I enjoy all his majesty of sentiment, all his correctness of judgment, all his beautiful propriety of diction.'

The fruits of James Hervey's Methodist awakening, and of his scientific and literary studies, joined with a natural gift for exuberant eloquence, are to be seen in *Meditations and Contemplations* (1746-7), and in their more strictly theological successor, *Theron and Aspasio* (1755). Both books are a strange

blend of materials, in the traditions both of Jeremy Taylor and John Ray. His theology seems to us unenterprising, though its strong Calvinistic tinge earned John Wesley's criticism, and led to an unedifying controversy. His first-hand observations of nature, however, and his diligent study linked to poetic imagination, though contributing little original to scientific knowledge, did much to popularize the 'back-to-nature' movement which was to develop into the Romantic Revival. And he forestalled John Wesley in teaching the rising middle classes to see 'the Wisdom of God manifested in the Works of the Creation'.

This fact has been obscured for later critics by Hervey's admittedly overloaded style, florid and imaginative like Jeremy Taylor's, but seldom matched with his in directness. Miltonic poetic diction, which enshrouded much eighteenth-century poetry in obscurity, exerted an evil influence on Methodism's prose-poet also. To speak of his 'pompous and posturing performance', however, as does the *Cambridge History of English Literature*, is to allow a striking phrase to perpetuate injustice. Hervey was neither pompous nor posturing, and although his highly-decorated style sounds artificial to modern ears, it is not merely a literary disguise. We find similar phrases in his early letters to his sister, in the account of his brother's death, and even in his own dying speeches. That he *could* write crisp, forceful prose, however, is shown in his rebuke to Beau Nash, a rebuke which so impressed the King of Bath that he preserved it to his dying day. Parts of it could almost have been written by John Wesley himself: 'Let me tell you beforehand, that . . . God will bring you into judgment. He sees me now write. He will observe you while you read. He notes down my words in His book. He will note down your consequent procedure. So that, not upon me, but upon your own self, will the neglecting or despising of my sayings turn.' Such also, apparently, could be his language when preaching from a few shorthand notes to his uneducated congregation, when he sometimes expounded briefly two or three texts at a time, which his parishioners obediently impressed on their minds by turning down the appropriate pages in their Bibles.

With 'polite society', however, for whom his books were avowedly written, Hervey's meditative, word-weaving nature inevitably fell into an exaggerated form of the conventional literary style exemplified in the contemporary phrase for letter-writing—'epistolary correspondence'. But always with a moralizing pill protruding from the sickly sweetness of his verbal syrup. Here is a fair sample, from *Reflections on a Flower-Garden*:

The greyness of the dawn decays gradually. Abundance of ruddy streaks tinge the fleece of the firmament; till, at length, the dappled aspect of the east is lost, in one ardent and boundless blush.—Is it the surmise of imagination, or do the skies really redden with shame, to see so many supinely stretched on their drowsy pillows? Shall man be lost in luxurious ease? shall man waste these precious hours in idle slumbers? while the vigorous sun is up and going on his Maker's errand? while all the feathered choir are hymning their Creator, and paying homage in harmony?—No. Let *him* heighten the melody of the tuneful tribes, by adding the rational strains of devotion. Let *him* improve the fragrant oblations of nature, by mingling, with the rising odours, the more refined breath of praise.

Even the kitchen garden can furnish him with imaginative material, 'parsley,

with her frizzled locks' and 'celery with her whitening arms', whilst according to Hervey, 'the beans stand firm, like files of embattled troops', and 'the tendrils of the cucumber creep into the sun; and, though basking in its hottest rays, they secrete for their master, and barrel up for his use, the most cooling juices of the soil'.

So frequently do the raw materials of poetry appear in his work that it comes as no surprise to learn that as a youth James Hervey would turn out pretty verses for a select circle of female admirers—only to abjure such bids for worldly praise when he became an Oxford Methodist. Yet some of those verses were later used—with others added, perhaps—to adorn his later prose works. Over one of them—a delicate little translation from Theocritus, which was even set to music—a lengthy correspondence raged in the *Gentleman's Magazine* during 1748, a correspondence closed by Hervey's 'worthy friends' avowing 'that he only rendered the lines into English from the Greek of Theocritus, for the sake of his female readers, he not aspiring to be a lofty poet, but only an humble christian'. Another poem, included in *Meditations upon the Tombs*, has been discarded from the hymn-book of Methodism only in the latest revision, and its last verse is still remembered by many:

*Good when He gives, supremely good;
Nor less when He denies;
E'en crosses, from His sov'reign hand,
Are blessings in disguise.*

This, by the way, seems to be the first appearance of the last familiar phrase, which has been ascribed to David Mallet, though he used it in a poem published a year later.

Had Hervey's imagination been harnessed more frequently to the discipline of verse, he might have become one of our better minor poets of nature or religion. Not that he was a slap-dash writer. His writings were subjected to constant polishing both by himself and others, and he often added or omitted passages at the advice of critics years after the first publication of a book. The fame which he had resolved not to seek as a poet, however, came to him unsought as a prose-poet, and men of his own day hailed him as—

*O more than bard in prose! to whom belong
Harmonious style and thought, in rhymeless song,*

whilst that overlauded minor poet Moses Browne—later to become Hervey's curate—could write:

*Sweet labours new thy genius meditates,
In prose, ear-rapturing like the voice of song.*

Hervey's own summing up of his abilities, in a letter to that well-known Baptist minister, John Ryland, is as follows: 'I have not a strong mind; I have not powers fitted for arduous researches; but I think I have a power of writing in somewhat of a striking manner, so far as to please mankind and recommend my dear Redeemer.' In a letter to the same divine in later years Hervey issued an *apologia* for such books as his, whose nature-descriptions were apt to invite

the charge of worldliness from narrow-minded saints. His words show that his natural leaning to 'elegant fancies' had been consciously utilized in the service of his Master: 'Such kind of writings suit the present taste. We don't love close thinking. That is most likely to win our approbation, which extenuates the fancy, without fatiguing the attention. Since this is the disposition of the age, let us endeavour to catch men by guile; turn even a foible to their advantage; and bait the gospel hook agreeably to the prevailing taste.'

So effectively did he 'bait the gospel hook' that the octavo volume upon which the Rev Richard Pearsall had accidentally stumbled in June 1746—one of an edition of 750—was soon in much greater demand than supply. It had contained only two large essays, *Meditations upon the Tombs* and *Reflections on a Flower-Garden*, together with a short *Descant upon Creation*. Soon Hervey was preparing a second volume, whose main essays were to be entitled *Contemplations on the Night* and *Contemplations on the Starry Heavens*, though the delay in printing was so great that he was able to add a short *Winter-Piece*. The first volume had been issued quietly, almost surreptitiously—Hervey's biography says it was published in February 1746, although its dedication is dated 20th May. The second edition, however (accompanied by Volume II), came forth with a flourish of trumpets from the *Gentleman's Magazine* in December 1747, and by the end of that month Hervey could arrange for John Wesley to distribute five guineas of the proceeds in charity. (Almost all Hervey's literary earnings went in this way, Samuel Richardson being one of the agents of his generosity.)

Retouched editions now followed in rapid succession, four more within the next year. By the end of the century over fifty editions had been published, and the popularity of Hervey's *Meditations* continued well past the middle of the nineteenth century. Soon the volumes were being translated into German, into French, into Dutch, Spanish, and Welsh, and even into—blank verse! Imitations poured forth from the press, as well as Hervey's own sequel, *Theron and Aspasio*, less ornate in style, but more adventurous in theology. Would-be writers asked Hervey for advice, and submitted their manuscripts for criticism. Even the Rev. Richard Pearsall, who had 'discovered' Hervey in 1746 and was already an author in his own right, was to be found five years later queueing up with his *Contemplations on the Ocean*, to which Hervey gave a kindly pat in *Theron and Aspasio*, saying that in it 'a refined fancy and a delicate philosophy, compose a chaplet for evangelical divinity'. In a private letter, however, he urged restraint on Pearsall—the advice sounds strange coming from the author of *Meditations and Contemplations*:

My worthy friend's genius is too rich; his invention quite luxuriant. He must use the pruning knife, and cut off several of the shoots. Yes, though they are perfectly beautiful, they must be sacrificed; that the fruit may acquire the finer flavour. There is a certain prettiness in some periods, that betrays us all into an ill-judged redundancy; which, though its neatness should secure it from being tiresome, yet weakens the force of the principal thought.

Hervey's *Meditations* became the rage, to be found not only in the homes of the polite, for whom they were intended, but even more frequently on the shelves of the would-be-polite, and of the pious-though-poor. A few independent individuals stood aloof from the general chorus of praise. That novelist

of sentimentality, Samuel Richardson, through whose hands as printer the book had first passed, had given Hervey his genuine congratulations, so that Hervey could reciprocate with good wishes for *Clarissa Harlowe*, who was making her début:

I heartily thank you for your kind Congratulation, on the Acceptance with which the Public has condescended to honour the Performance. Your entertaining and improving Piece I hope will meet with much greater Encouragement, & (which I dare say is the one Scope of your Desires) be productive of more abundant Good. May the great Author of Holiness & Happiness bless them both, how far so ever they spread, how long so ever they Live!

A little later, however, when both books were spreading far and wide in different languages, one of Richardson's titled correspondents, after spending her Sunday afternoon reading the first volume of Hervey's *Meditations*, wrote to him: 'I suppose this work is reckoned a well-wrote piece; and yet the style does not please me in many places. Do you think it is quite easy, sir?' To which Richardson replied: 'I love the man, and think him a devout and good man; but his style is too flowery for prose, too affected: a judicious friend of mine calls it *prose run mad*.'

Dr Johnson, when becalmed in a Scotch inn with little but Hervey's ubiquitous volumes to solace weary travellers, 'treated it with ridicule, and would not allow even the scene of the dying Husband and Father to be pathetick'. Boswell was pained, though he felt bound to add: 'I am not an impartial judge; for Hervey's *Meditations* engaged my affections in my early years.' All the same, Boswell seems to have enjoyed Johnson's spontaneous burlesque of Hervey—*A Meditation on a Pudding*—sufficiently to preserve it pretty well *verbatim*. Hugh Blair also, as Regius Professor of Rhetoric and Belles-Lettres at Edinburgh University, advised his students 'to imitate Mr. Hervey's piety, rather than his style'. In spite of these justified criticisms, however, there is little doubt that Hervey's Gothic gloom and his genuine love of nature, heightened in their presentation by a rich imagination and by religious emotion, were of some importance in preparing the way for the full flowering of the Romantic Revival both here and in Europe, more especially in Germany, where his *Meditations* were rivalled in popularity only by Young's *Night Thoughts* and Richardson's *Clarissa Harlowe*.

Of much more importance to Hervey himself, however, without any doubt, would be the fact that his writings were the instruments of spiritual reformation in the lives of many people. John Valton, one of Wesley's preachers, tells how in his youth he 'was very sensibly affected by reading Hervey's *Meditations*', whilst the book also provided the turning-point in the life of that queer piece of spiritual flotsam, Cornelius Cayley. William Blake acknowledged himself a disciple of Hervey, and the poet Dr Nathaniel Cotton brought about the conversion of an even greater poet, poor William Cowper, confined in Cotton's 'Collegium Insanorum', by giving him Hervey's *Meditations* as a mental sedative. Charles Wesley could refer to the 'academic ease' of 'our own Isocrates', and wrote a two-part elegy on Hervey's death. John Wesley—who had criticized both the *Meditations* and *Theron and Aspasio*, nevertheless referred to some of Hervey's words as 'worthy to be wrote in letters of gold', and quoted

freely from the more subdued and theological *Theron and Aspasio*, both in his sermons, in *Original Sin*, and in the *Survey of the Wisdom of God*, where his subject-matter was so similar. Two of the six long quotations here are from the second volume of Hervey's *Meditations*—though Wesley follows Hervey's advice to Pearsall, and uses the pruning-hook liberally. So much did Wesley think about these passages, however, that he retained them in all three editions published in his lifetime, and some of them were even perpetuated in Robert Mudie's greatly modernized nineteenth-century edition of Wesley's volumes. All in all, though James Hervey's writings are not to the taste of modern readers of slick journalism, they have played a useful part both in literature and life, and even now genuine gold can there be discovered, gleaming through the surrounding dross. The Editor of the *Gentleman's Magazine* bared his head with unaccustomed reverence in this simple tribute on Hervey's death: 'In learning and genius inferior to few, in benevolence and piety inferior to none.'

FRANK BAKER

The M
of
No o
Its le
diffic
fact t
social
trade
Midd
now
and
towa
in th
the E
demo
a soci
is giv
Armo
about
be te
the b
towa
tive s
inten
hope
Tem
An a
think
entia
work
the n
It wa
Dr. C

Chris
Ep
Chris
Histo
fican
ings
Teut
and
that
jargo
the
and
quite
bilit
to us

Recent Literature

Edited by R. Newton Flew

The National Church and the Social Order: Report of the Social and Industrial Council of the Church Assembly. (Church House, Westminster, S.W.1., 5s. 6d.)

No one can complain that the compilers of this Report have not done their work well. Its length and detail suggest thoroughness and also something else, namely the difficulties encountered in attempting to answer the question at issue, owing to the fact that the Church, like any other historic institution, has changed its attitude to social problems through the centuries—hence the large portion devoted to the stock in trade of the social historian, the Just Price, the Gilds, the anti-usury edicts of the Middle Ages and succeeding chapters on Erastianism, with copious references to the now rather neglected Hooker. The narrative is as judicious as that of Hooker himself and no Free Churchman will be offended. Indeed he will have reason to warm towards much of what is said about the social consciousness and effects of Puritanism in the formation of modern concepts of civil liberty and popular government. Yet the Established Church, even if it has but a faint record of enthusiasm for popular democracy, can boast of a cell within its ranks which preached and tried to inaugurate a socialism based on the central tenet of loving one's neighbour. An interesting account is given of the Christian Socialists of the last century with special references to Thomas Arnold, F. D. Maurice, Charles Kingsley and a few others, but there is not enough about J. M. Ludlow whose contribution seems always to be neglected. Readers may be tempted to turn to the end pages at once rather than work their way through from the beginning, particularly if guidance is sought about the attitude of the Church towards the pressing problems of today. They may be disappointed at the lack of positive statements; but to expect this is to ask for more than the authors of the Report intend. There is however a lot in these latter portions which is challenging and hopeful, but one can hardly resist the opinion that the hope would be livelier if William Temple had been succeeded by half a dozen churchmen with something of his stature. An appendix to the Report has notes about some of the influences on Anglican social thinking during the last five and twenty years. These include Neo-Thomism, Existentialism, the World Council of Churches, the views of Reinhold Niebuhr and the work of William Temple brought into prominence by the various conferences such as the now famous one at Malvern. The social influences of evangelism are not included. It was perhaps too early for the enquirers to assess any results of the campaign of Dr. Graham which attracted many Anglicans, both clergy and laity. G. ILLTYD LEWIS.

Christian Eschatology and Social Thought, by Ray C. Petry. (Abingdon Press, via Epworth Bookshop, \$5.)

Christian Eschatology and Social Thought, by Dr Ray C. Petry, Professor of Church History in Duke University, deals with a theme of profound importance: 'the significant interaction between the Church's doctrine of "The Last Things" and its teachings on social responsibility.' To his task Dr Petry has brought all the solid and almost Teutonic virtue of the most meticulous American scholarship. He has read widely and deeply, and is clearly the master of his material. It is all the more to be regretted that the wise and necessary things he has to say are cloaked and choked in polysyllabic jargon. On the opening page 'historical relationships' are 'indifferently capitalised', the 'heightened tempo of human progress' is 'potentially within the human grasp', and 'these glowing dithyrambs have since given way to gloomy predictions, fitting in quite well with the sinister purposes of hypernationalistic politicians, on the ineluctability of further wars'. A man dealing seriously with a difficult theme has every right to use technical and precise theological language, but this sort of writing merely puts

barriers in the way of understanding. That grouse out of the way, I must add that the barriers are worth clearing. The theme, briefly, is this. It is implied by some liberal theologians, and assumed by Christians influenced by their theology, that it is more important to have a real interest in the concerns and challenges of this present life, than to worry about the expectation of a Second Advent. It is similarly implied and assumed on the other side that the true concern of the Christian should be with the return in glory of his Lord and not with the tawdry and passing affairs of this world. Both views are partial, and therefore misleading. The fact is that a compulsive and securely-founded social concern can come only from an understanding and acceptance of the eternal and extra-temporal Kingdom. Eschatology, rightly understood, becomes 'a positive incentive from the posthistorical future to an enhanced co-ordination of efforts in a socially responsive present. . . . If human values inhere in anything more lasting than their own limited tenure, they must derive such worth from a worshipful dedication to God and His eternal kingdom. But if they give themselves in enduring loyalty to a kingdom that is beyond history, and not made by it, they must also feel the benign influences of kingdom community in their socially effective and historically valid present. This is not a thesis to be defended; it is the considered verdict of Christian thought as it has come down to us from the earliest times.' The argument is that it is a false approach to attempt to deduce from the teaching of Jesus an ideal for society towards which we must consistently strive. It is rather that, through the power of the Risen Lord, the future kingdom, which is the will of God, makes the past and the present, although it is served by them. Present society, if it is to obey the will of God, must conform to the pattern of the social future. The major part of the book is a commentary on this basic proposition, impressively-documented from the period of the New Testament to A.D. 1500. It is not, however, a mere piling up of references. There is shrewd judgement and revealing comment—as, for instance, in the remark that the late medieval Church over-simplified and fossilized the plan of salvation by forgetting that there are unpredictable surprises laid up in God's blessing. There is a passionate concern that the Church should find life and power from God for its socially redemptive task, living and moving in Him, and not bringing Him in as a constitutional monarch giving Royal Assent to human plans. There is an equally passionate conviction that without the sense of eternal things the mortal and temporal are futile. This is a good book, on a theme that needs to be considered. But, all the same, I wish it were easier to read.

E. ROGERS

The Pauline View of Man in Relation to Its Judaic and Hellenistic Background, by W. David Stacey. (Macmillan, 25s.)

Christianity according to St Paul is not to be defined in terms of Judaism or Hellenism or a mixture of both; the determining influence is the revelation of God, hidden from the Greek and not disclosed to the Jew, but revealed to the believer in the Gospel facts which are creative of the Christian faith. This thesis of the Rev. David Stacey's first and very promising book is developed in terms of the relation between revelation and faith as seen in Paul's account of man. The author is in good company in holding this to be an issue crucial for the understanding of the Apostle. The first half of the book contains a competent examination, based on wide reading, of the influence on Paul of his Jewish birth and education, and of the ideas and speech of the Greeks. Mr Stacey shows that when Paul found Jewish terms inadequate for his purpose he was ready to use Hellenistic words. But whatever the words used, the meanings sprang from the experience of the man in Christ for whom the encounter with the risen Lord was decisive. The conclusion, 'Paul was neither Jew nor Greek. He may have been debtor to both, and especially to the Jew, but, in the crucial matter of God and His ways with men, he was a Christian, born beside the Damascus road', explains much of

the paradox and of the originality in the teaching of one who was a missionary rather than a systematic theologian. Herein the author traverses well-worn ground, though the treatment of the material is fresh and contains clear and useful summaries of previous discussion. The main contribution of the book comes in the second half, where Mr Stacey submits to careful examination all the words concerning human nature used by Paul. In discussing what Paul has to say concerning soul, spirit, flesh, body, etc., the author makes good use of his own principle of interpretation and draws skillfully on recent scholarship. (He is unfortunate in having concluded his work before the publication of Mr C. A. Pierce's study on *conscience*. This calls for some revision of Mr Stacey's estimate and could, I think, throw light on his conclusions.) The details of the word-study are open to some criticism but the reader can be grateful for an admirable exercise in the analysis of Pauline terms. Many readers would be more grateful had the author translated the Hebrew and Greek words in the text (this would have avoided a misprint on p.223) and added a Glossary, and a Subject Index. The strength of the analytical element in Mr Stacey's study reveals a weakness. There is less of a clear statement of Paul's answer to: *What is Man?* The book concludes that 'from studying Paul we have learnt little about the constitution of man, but very much about man in relation to God'. Can this stand? The Christian doctrine of man is derived from the teaching and mission of Christ. The author's decision not to examine the influence on Paul of the historical Jesus and the Church's tradition of His teaching, which includes Christ's own conviction of what man ought to be, renders him vulnerable. Can we maintain that 'the influence of Jesus on Paul's view of man was slight'. Such questions, however, must not cloud a final word of appreciation for a young scholar whose high degree of achievement promises much greater things to come. The problems lying behind the argument are of first importance and Mr Stacey has led us a long way to their solution.

MARCUS WARD

St John's Gospel: A Commentary, by R. H. Lightfoot; edited by C. F. Evans. (Oxford University Press, 30s.)

A certain sadness overshadows the appearance of this most welcome book, because the author of it is no longer with us to share in the pleasure of its publication. Its final preparation has been in the hands of one of his former students. The sadness, however, is softened by our delight that in the book the author's personality and influence is renewed among us. Professor Lightfoot had completed the commentary itself, but not the Introduction. He had, however, left a number of separate studies, and these have been skilfully blended by the editor in the form of an Introduction. The book was originally written for the Clarendon Bible, but since its length greatly exceeded the limit required by that series, it now appears separately. Its purpose, clearly enunciated, is to be 'a religious and theological exposition of the text of St John's Gospel'. We learn that 'it is not proposed to discuss at length such difficult and controverted questions as its date, authorship, and place of origin'. The Gospel is divided into fourteen sections. In each section, first the text (in the Revised Version) is printed. Then follows a full, running exposition of the section, and at the end of the exposition, some brief exegetical notes on difficult verses. The whole commentary is marked by a sensitive and sympathetic appreciation of the Johannine thought and idiom. Numerous passages are illuminated by comments of great insight, expressed with that model clarity of expression and exactness of style which we learned to associate with the one-time Editor of the *Journal of Theological Studies*. It is difficult to pick out individual passages for special comment, but it may be of interest to mention his treatment of Chapter 21. He regards it, as many others do, as a later appendix added to the original Gospel. It is not, however, to be interpreted as an attempt to dispel the current belief that the Beloved Disciple had received a promise that he would not die

before the Second Coming of Christ. Rather it is an affirmation of the parallel but distinct functions of Peter and the Beloved Disciple within the Church. Peter is the man of action, whose task it is 'to have oversight of the practical life of the Church'. John, however, 'was to remain, throughout his life, the witness and guardian of the Lord's revelation and of the truth of the Gospel'. Although the author disclaims the intention of dealing fully with merely critical questions, he does indicate his position in regard to some of them. There is a clear and convincing assessment of the relative influence of Hebrew and Greek modes of thought upon the evangelist. He agrees with C. H. Dodd and C. K. Barrett, as against earlier Johannine scholars, in thinking that the theory of complicated 'misplacements' within the Gospel is quite unnecessary. In contrast, he speaks of 'the extreme care with which this Gospel appears to have been composed as a complete and coherent whole'. Somewhat surprisingly, he is quite out of sympathy with Gardner Smith's thesis (which appears to be gaining ground in recent years) that the Fourth Gospel was written in complete independence of the other three. We should almost have expected that one who, in the elucidation of the Synoptic Gospels, was a leading exponent of the power of oral tradition would have been inclined to find in the Fourth Gospel the written form of another, independent stream of that oral tradition. For Professor Lightfoot, however, some of the fundamental significance of this Gospel is to be found in its relationship to the other three. Its author, he believes, not only knew them, but here set himself 'to interpret . . . and draw out the significance of the original events'. 'Without St John's Gospel the earlier Gospels are largely a puzzle, an unsolved problem, to which his Gospel is designed to offer the key.' In the main, however, Professor Lightfoot does not concern himself with questions of introduction and criticism. The reader will not find, for instance, any attempt to determine what in the gospel may be regarded as factual history and what as interpretation. In spite of the protests of those who favour only 'theological' commentaries, we badly need a commentary where this perplexing question is faced resolutely and frankly. Nor do we find a full discussion as to whether the Synoptics are right in identifying the Last Supper with the Passover meal (as Jeremias affirms), as against John, who clearly treats it as a pre-Passover meal. But perhaps we have no right to complain, since the author warns us in advance that the book is not concerned with these issues. It is, however, disappointing to find that the Index does not always guide the reader to the pages where such matters are touched upon. This is the third major exposition of the Fourth Gospel to be published in this country within four years. We have hardly had time to digest the distinguished contributions of C. H. Dodd and C. K. Barrett. But this further book by Professor Lightfoot is not overshadowed by them, and makes its own distinctive contribution to our understanding of this Gospel, the more acceptable because its wealth of knowledge and discernment is offered with such gracious humility.

C. LESLIE MITTON

The Protestant Way, by Kenneth Hamilton. (Epworth Press, 21s.)

'Scratch an Englishman and you find a Protestant', yet most Englishmen, while aware of an emotional attachment to Protestantism as part of a vague attitude of opposition to Catholicism, would be hard put to say precisely what the word means. This 'essay in interpretation' starts from the variety of meanings which Protestantism has had in history, and its purpose is to discover whether there is such a thing as a distinctive 'Protestant Way'. The author seeks to distinguish the Protestant protest from the Protestant revolt, and holds that whatever else Protestantism has drawn to itself in the course of its development, it consists essentially in 'the human attempt to express certain values within a party'. His object is to help us to understand these values by exploring the forms under which Protestantism has attempted to give them an historic existence. This might lead us to expect a more historical and systematic treatment than

that which follows, and such a procedure would have helped many readers more easily to have grasped the points at issue. Instead we have a series of very able and interesting, though somewhat discursive, chapters dealing with the many issues of Protestant belief and morality. The drawback of this method is that a large amount of historical and theological material is presupposed or taken for granted, and we get rather many sentences beginning somewhat airily with such statements as 'Protestantism says . . .'. This criticism, however, is not intended to detract from the value of the book, in which the author shows an enviable maturity of insight and judgement. The really valuable thing is that there emerges from the discussions something which can be recognized as the Protestant point of view, an attitude which the author himself 'protests'. This personal attitude is central to the argument. Protestant theology, it is claimed, is wrongly charged with egocentricity, yet it recognizes that the whole record of Scripture is nothing but the record of God's activity for the salvation of man. God and man are the two poles of this doctrine: hence the importance of the witnesses to and interpreters of it, and the essentially personal nature of all the great themes of Reformation (and Scriptural) theology. Whereas an 'objective' view of inspiration says we know God's revelation because we know where the Church is, and a 'subjective' view appeals to 'religious experience' in an individualistic way, the author believes that the Protestant understanding of the way of God's revelation rejects both alternatives, and stands between a false absolutism and an anarchic relativism by setting over against both the ways of 'dialogue', a metaphor which he adopts from Buber in preference to the more usual 'Divine-Human Encounter', since it can be used also to describe man's encounter with his neighbour. This leads, not indeed to psychological certitude based on a conclusion drawn from evidence, but to certainty—the certainty of personal encounter, dialogue, trust, love. The issues behind the Protestant-Catholic debate are discussed in this thoughtful book at the deepest level. The argument demands the close attention of the reader, who will not always find the meaning easy to grasp. Not all Protestants would agree with some of the author's conclusions as to what Protestantism says, yet this would not surprise him, and he defends the freedom to be wrong as the most precious and most costly of all freedoms. Perhaps this is a note insufficiently sounded amongst us at the present time. Many aspects of historical Protestantism are brought under critical review by a writer whose vigorous faith from within the central Reformed tradition helps us to realise that Catholicism is not the real alternative to that distorted Protestantism with which many are familiar and dissatisfied.

NORMAN P. GOLDHAWK

Kingdom and Church, a Study in the Theology of the Reformation, by T. F. Torrance.
(Oliver & Boyd, 16s.)

This book requires readers who can cope with sixteenth-century German, Latin, and French as well as a theological English that is not always pellucid. It consists of three essays dealing in turn with the thought of Luther, Bucer, and Calvin, and entitled respectively 'The Eschatology of Faith', 'The Eschatology of Love', and 'The Eschatology of Hope'. Professor Torrance admits that naturally the three reformers all thought of the Kingdom in terms of all three virtues, but he thinks he detects a particular emphasis on one of the three in each case, with the result that the relation between the Kingdom and the Church and the place of the Church in history are somewhat differently conceived. Differences between Calvin and Luther are specially stressed (if not always convincingly demonstrated), and Calvin is always right as against Luther, while Bucer, who in some ways occupies a mediating position, is claimed as standing essentially on Calvin's side. It is all very neat, and copious evidence is offered in support of the argument. But when we are told that the distinction between Luther and Bucer is that Bucer insists on Christians translating their faith into active love—as if Luther did

not—then it can only be said that there is a lot of evidence that has been overlooked. And when a special section is devoted to Calvin's view of the relation between the Word and the Spirit, while Luther's teaching on the same subject is not discussed, it can hardly be said that we have proper ground for comparison. It is all very one-sided. Not that there were no differences between the reformers, for there undoubtedly were, and they are well worth investigating. An adequate discussion of them might do much towards bridging the gaps that have long divided the heirs of the reformation, and as a stimulus to such discussion Professor Torrance's book is to be welcomed. It is also a contribution to the ecumenical debate of our time, in which the subject with which it deals is undoubtedly of central importance. It will therefore be of interest to others besides Lutherans and Calvinists, as revealing the mind of a distinguished younger theologian on this theme.

PHILIP S. WATSON

From My New Shelf

BY R. NEWTON FLEW

The Book Room; the Story of the Methodist Publishing House and Epworth Press, by Frank Cumbers (Epworth Press, 10s.). Methodism has not seen a book like this before. It is not an unparalleled event for the Book Steward to write and publish a book—witness the highly delightful reminiscences of Charles H. Kelly—but the story of the Publishing House had not been told even in outline before Frank Cumbers was asked by the Wesley Historical Society to deliver this lecture. One could imagine that a book about the Book Room would be like Ezekiel's valley of dry bones—'and lo! they were very dry'—but Dr Cumbers's gaiety and wit have made the dry bones live. At the same time this is a scholarly piece of research, with real learning behind it. The great difficulty is that the author has to tell the story, not of one house only, but of five—that is, up to 1932. He comes from the 'Old Body', as the Wesleyans were affectionately called. But he knows how to be 'more than fair' to the Primitive Methodists. He has 'formed the impression, reading through masses of official records, magazines and books, that the Primitive Methodists looked upon their Book Room with more sentiment and affection than the members of any other branch of the Methodist Churches did upon theirs'. I entirely agree. This book unveils a picture of the struggles which the Methodist folk had to get any education at all (pp.14, 83). 'It has been the custom of earlier writers to declare that Methodism has not been essentially a literary Church. It seems to me that such a dictum is due for modification.' In the chapter on 'Methodist Literature' Arthur S. Peake has his own royal place, and Sir William Hartley has his. The chapter on Book Stewards and Editors is full of fascinating sketches; that on the Book Room and its money should horrify other publishers—so generous to other causes did Conference force the Book Rooms to be. Every

Methodist preacher, ministerial and lay, should read this book—and then lend it to an Anglican friend.

Only One Way Left, by George F. Macleod (The Iona Community, 10s. 6d.). The last paragraph in the opening section, 'Explaining this Book', begins with a question by the reader: 'So the writer actually claims to be a prophet?' And the answer is: 'Why not? The essence of a Bible prophet is not that he forecasts the future. It is that he fears in his bones what is going to happen if we don't recover God's design right now. Is not this the motivation of every sincere Christian's ordinary actions? "Would God that all the Lord's people were prophets." ' No wonder that when these Cunningham Lectures were delivered in New College, Edinburgh, 'they drew immense crowds', as Professor J. S. Stewart said, 'and caused a tremendous stir'. This book is a prophetic utterance coming flamingly from the heart of a living man. Three comments I would make, all appreciative. First, Nobody ought to say: 'This is the social gospel.' 'We have heard it all before.' 'We must save individual souls first.' Did not John Wesley say, 'The gospel of Christ knows no religion but social, no holiness but social holiness'? Second, the book is built on a Christology; its structure is Christ, who is verily Prophet, Priest, and King. But the image of building is inadequate. In these pages the stones are living; they cry out. Third, no man is 'saved' unless his daily work and his motive for it, his comments and convictions about other people, are 'saved' with him. Of course this includes his politics and his reading of the daily newspaper. 'Our tragedy today is the divorce between "Holiness" and the "Health Services"' (p.70). This is indeed a book for minister and layman to read.

Sensism; the Philosophy of the West, by Charles Smith (Truth Seeker Co., New York, \$10). Who among the genuine bookmen of this country would not be visited by a pang of envy in opening these two volumes with their 1,612 pages? The attempt at a new philosophy is sumptuously encased. The more's the pity that there are few marks of genuine philosophy. 'Socrates, Augustine, Descartes did not look inward' (p.24). Yet Descartes is called (p.37) 'the Columbus of introspective research'. 'The seeming clarity of simple language in sacred writings, such as the parables in the Gospel, are masterpieces of confusion' (p.33). The grammar and accuracy of this sentence are on the same level. But there are some indications that the author has read some philosophy. 'After twenty-seven years of reasoning and research', he reached the conclusion that 'the object of awareness is always without'. 'That sentence is to me what "I Think, therefore I exist" was to Descartes.' We seem to have heard Mr Smith's sentence before, only in Latin! It is not such a discovery as he thinks. But his verdict on religion, and especially Christianity, is the section which will interest British readers most. Here are typical statements which will shew the quality of Sensism. 'The N.T. is social propaganda in fictional form' (p.1,282). 'The Gospels were forged in the second century, and predated 100 years'. (p.1,289). 'The Holy Bible is an arsenal of analogies, writing value and other persons through personificational teleology' (p.1,293). 'As children exclaim: "Santa Claus is coming!" so evangelists proclaim: "Jesus is coming!"' (p.313). 'The Gospels are pure fictions' (p.1,293). 'Jesus is a verbally created imaginal totem' (p.1,360). Mr Charles Smith apparently has no use for Christian ethics: 'Every moral upsurge lowers the physical standard for survival. Under Judaic Christianity men save their souls by saving the bodies of the weak and the defective.' ' "Be ashamed to die before doing something to help debase the race" expresses the soulset of most humanitarians, Christian or communist' (p.264). Charles Smith does not argue. He just tells us. He lists fifty-four or fifty-five authors who have maintained that Jesus never lived (pp.1,346-7). He gives us none of their arguments, only their names, and since one of the most famous names is misspelt, the reviewer is

hard put to it to keep his thoughts charitable! But he can surely say that if this book is the best that popular anti-Christian propaganda can produce, the Churches have nothing to fear. The issue of the historicity of Jesus has been raised before, and the positive, immensely strong answer has been given, notably in our time by Professor H. G. Wood.

But Above All . . . More Sermons from St George's, by David N. Francis (Epworth Press, 6s.). This is a book for Everyman, whether minister or layman, who wants to know what the good news is. Every page is sparkingly alive. It is a real pleasure to turn over these pages and find the offer of God set in the forefront all the time. There is a tiny bunch of sentences in the last chapter: 'That was one of the grand things about Jesus. His great word was never "Go on!" but "Follow Me!" He never pushed from behind; He always went on in front.' The title is taken, of course, from Bishop Reynolds's contribution to *The Book of Common Prayer*, the General Thanksgiving, and the first sermon describes it as 'A Thank You which only Christians can say, but which—when in Christ—all of us can say, and *always*'.

Christology and Myth in the New Testament, by Geraint Vaughan Jones (Allen & Unwin, 21s.). After the publication in 1947 of his first large book, *Democracy and Civilization*, the author has found time during his ministry in Glasgow to write this lucid, devout, and learned book. It will at once, I hope, take a leading place in the controversy aroused by Rudolph Bultmann's attempt to 'demythologize' the New Testament. The meaning of 'myth' and 'mythological' varies according to the philosophy professed by the author who writes about it. According to Bultmann, the real purpose of 'myth' is not to offer an objective picture of the world as it is, but to express man's understanding of himself in his world. 'Myth' has continually to do with a perpetually menaced realm. Man cannot escape from his sense that he is 'living toward death', or from the *Sorge* (anxiety) which is the most characteristic constituent of being. According to Mr Vaughan Jones, 'myth' is the language of religion, and should be taken seriously as such. In Part I he deals first with the meaning and the connexion of the terms 'Myth' and 'Gospel'; and then with the terms History, *Geschichte* and Myth. Part II describes 'the Mythological form' of the Christology of the Epistles, and examines its sources. Wilhelm Bousset's theory describing the thought as Hellenistic and un-Hebraic is criticized, and the Wisdom Literature is preferred as a more likely influence on the mind of the early Christians. Part III is called 'Kyrios Christos', and the title is regarded as 'originating in the Jerusalem community very soon after Pentecost'. To explain the ascription of the title to Jesus, the author experiments with the concept of 'emergence', as used by Samuel Alexander, but finally he rejects any evolutionary approach to Christology. He rejects, however, also the notion of pre-existence as 'both improbable, and not deducible from the known data'. At the same time, he sees the picture of Jesus as one whose knowledge of God was unique and complete. He states (p.147) that the affirmation of the Lordship of Jesus is fundamental to the Christian faith, and that, in Paul's words, no man can say that Jesus is Lord except by the Holy Spirit. In two chapters in Part III, Mr Vaughan Jones deals with the two questions of Jesus' transcendence over the created order, and His position within the created series. This is followed by a chapter on the 'New Testament Mythology of Evil'. The question to be decided is whether there is reality behind the myth of demons and the realm of darkness—'a horrible fifth or sixth dimension of being', in Barth's moving phrase. Mr Vaughan Jones never minimizes the fact that Jesus came to deal with Sin, and is at his best in this chapter. In Part IV, the final summing-up of the whole work, he deals with 'The Myth as Logos'. Here he attempts the very difficult task of providing a meaning for the word 'Myth'. 'Ultimately', he

says, 'mythical and mythological modes of thought are pictorial, symbolic, and archetypal'. The word 'archetype' needs especial definition. In a work published in 1943, Karl Mannheim drew attention to the importance of what he calls Christian archetypes, as necessary for social integration, and for the continuity of the religious experience. Examples are Baptism, the Eucharist, the Good Shepherd, the Parable, The Saviour. Some of these 'primordial images' are not peculiar to Christianity—e.g. the cult of the Divine Mother and Child in the Church of Rome, in which the Virgin Mary is 'given a mediatorial place hardly less conspicuous than that of the Son'. The Saviour (*Sotër*) is purely mythological in the mystery religions, but historical in the New Testament. Part IV concludes with a discussion of 'the Myth as Norm', in which the writer answers the main question which Bultmann has asked: 'Can Christian preaching really expect the man of today to recognize the mythical world-picture as true? That is absurd and impossible.' The writer answers, with Brunner, that Bultmann in his question has failed to distinguish between the antique world-picture, and the mythological language of the New Testament, in which the supremacy of Christ, who is an historical person, is expressed. For Christian faith, it is no matter whether Christ 'sits at the right hand of God', or whether He is diffused through space. But respectful as Mr Vaughan Jones is toward Bultmann, his closing pages reveal the strange gap in the would-be existential theology of the great Marburg scholar. 'To have any reference to human needs the "myth" must speak to man in his situation. . . . But it must also be understood as speaking to him of that which transcends his own position in the world, and as pointing away from him to the Kyrios to whom, in its Christological form, it testifies.' A collection of similar criticisms could be made from this book. Does Bultmann believe in the Resurrection? Not as the early disciples did! He disregards the early 'Kerygma' in the Acts. His attitude to the Resurrection-narratives in the Synoptic Gospels is negative. Even of the Cross he declares: 'The saving efficacy of the cross of Christ is not derived from the fact that it is the cross of Christ.' Mr Vaughan Jones says (pp.54, 57): 'As far as Bultmann is concerned the Synoptic Gospels might never have been written.' It is the Synoptic narrative, rather than the language of St Paul, that has been most formative in the creation of Christian piety, and that, too, despite the effect of Romans on Luther, Wesley, and Barth. My own misgivings about Mr Vaughan Jones's book are first that the word 'myth' and 'mythological' are carrying too heavy a load for the ordinary Christian to bear. That is perhaps inevitable. But the second, the rejection of the concept of the Eternal Sonship, is another matter. It calls to mind a story of W. R. Maltby. He was talking with one who did not believe that God became man, and who said in conclusion: 'I grant you that it is the loveliest thought that ever entered into the mind of man.' To which W. R. M. replied: 'Then presumably it had entered, farther back, into the mind of God?' That may be a fitting comment on the Article in the Creed: 'Begotten by His Father before all worlds.'

The Inspiration and Authority of the Bible, by Norman H. Snaith (Epworth Press, 3s. 6d.). This booklet is the first 'A. S. Peake Memorial Lecture.' Principal Snaith was the natural choice of the electors to initiate a new series of lectures in the realm of biblical scholarship. He begins with a criticism of those who still regard the Bible as infallible, and shows that the first departure from that position was not in 'the higher criticism', nor in 'the Modernists', but in Luther himself. The modern attack 'has arisen from the wide knowledge which has come to us in recent times'. The result has been 'new attempts to re-estimate the uniqueness of the Bible'. The uniqueness is not in literary style, not in the myths and legends, not in the early laws, not in the supposed infallibility of the biblical writers in the sphere of historical tradition. The 'Golden thread' in Holy Writ is the action of God the Saviour. The New Testament

is the story of His mighty saving power breaking down all barriers, and taking His 'salvation unto the end of the earth'. Dr Snaith is always interesting, especially when he is dealing with the Old Testament. (By the way, what imp of mischief caused the substitution of 'New' for 'Old' in the reference (p.44) to his very interesting book, *The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament?*). He is less at home with his Luther references than with his Bible. But Luther himself would have preferred Dr Snaith like that.

Freedom and Education, by John Christie (Epworth Press, 2s. 6d.). The Beckly Lecture in 1956 was delivered by the Principal of Jesus College, Oxford. He has had a richer experience of education than most of us. Winchester, Trinity College, Oxford, Army training in 1918—all contributed their quota. He has been Head both of Repton and of Westminster. He has known the Oxford of 1920, of 1930, and of 1950, and he praises the third period of undergraduates most of all. These pages are full of mature wisdom, but the last ten pages especially are to be admired. Every parent who can gain anything from the printed page should study this lecture; and of course every teacher will want to read it.

Claude Montefiore; The Man and His Thought, by the Very Rev. W. R. Matthews (University of Southampton Press, 2s. 6d.). This is the first in a series of biennial lectures in memory of a very great scholar and a most humble saint. The Dean of St Paul's has given a most valuable analysis and appreciation of Montefiore's religious thought. Most of his literary activity was devoted to the explanation and defence of Liberal Judaism. Dr Matthews points out that 'the conflict between Liberal and Orthodox in Judaism is one phase of a conflict which exists to some extent in all religions, and notably in Christianity'. Montefiore traces the defects of Judaism at the time of Christ to 'the belief of the Rabbis that they had an inspired and perfect book—that is, to the dogma of verbal inspiration'. That concerns us all, Jew and Christian alike. And Claude Montefiore has something to say to this riven modern world about the future of Judaism. In his opinion, the Jews are destined to be a religious brotherhood, not a separate people, nation, or race. Dr Matthews has sketched with the hand of a master the leading characteristics of Montefiore's thought.

The Greatness and Glory of Christ, by Robert Rendall (Pickering & Inglis, 10s. 6d.). These devout expository studies are not intended as a contribution to systematic theology. They are meditations on the Person of Christ. The author explains that there are certain passages of Scripture in which Christians perceive the great focal points of faith. These invariably magnify the greatness and glory of Christ. This book brings together a number of papers, hitherto unpublished, which seek to gain fresh insights of truth from several passages of this kind in the New Testament. Mr Rendall begins with Ephesians and Colossians, notes their catholicity of outlook, and sets that characteristic side by side with the catholicity of John's Gospel. This is a good beginning. On p.17 he says: 'It would be tempting to search Luke's Gospel for similar preoccupation with this divine catholicity of outlook.' One reader wishes he had yielded to the temptation, and given a firm scriptural grounding to the concept of catholicity in the Nicene Creed. Mr Rendall acknowledges his deep debt to commentaries, but only mentions Westcott and Lightfoot, and E. H. Broadbent. He accepts the traditional view of the authorship of Second Peter, though he hardly notices the Epistle at all. These meditations are devout; their one purpose is to magnify Christ. Dr W. R. Maltby, in his little *Manual on Philippians*, suggests as a question to be answered in any fellowship group: 'What is "magnify"? Explain to a child.' There are many grown-up children in the congregations of this island to whom this book might just fail to supply the guidance for which they are seeking.

Excursions with God: Travelling with a Purpose in Five Continents, by Thomas R. Griffin, L.Th. (Epworth Press, 10s. 6d.). There is not one word of exaggeration in the Foreword by Mr Russell Shearer and the note by Dr Sangster on the cover of this book. 'Other travellers will feel rebuked', says Dr Sangster, 'that they have gathered in comparison so poor a harvest of illustrative material.' Yes; I certainly do. 'Mr Griffin really cares about people', says Mr Shearer. 'I believe that this book will convey the essential message of our Christian faith to large numbers of people who are insensitive to theological argument.' Yes; I believe that too, says a would-be theologian! There are thirty-nine tiny chapters in 175 pages. You are whirled at breathless speed from picturesque Australia to Oberammergau, and then find yourself at Madeley, and then in the British Museum, looking at the Codex Sinaiticus, and then sharing an interview with a most immaculately-clad laundryman in Ceylon, who looked like an ambassador for that Pearl of the Orient. No aeroplane travelled at this speed! Oh! what more can I say? you've not read more than twenty pages yet. And you've missed out the accidental interview with an Australian Prime Minister! And before the next ten pages are scanned, you are in Venice, glorying in the magical colours—and suddenly overhearing the remark of a visitor who obviously came from somewhere in the English Midlands: 'Isn't it sniffy along this 'ere canal?' Yes; we do see life in Mr Griffin's book, and, better still, the way to eternal life.

Calvin's Doctrine of the Work of Christ, by J. F. Jansen (James Clarke, 8s. 6d.). There is a welcome addition to the growing library of modern Calvin studies. The writer is Professor of Religion in Hanover College, Indiana. He has given us a scholarly and lucid piece of research on the traditional Protestant formula, 'Christ as Prophet, Priest and King', which is now coming back into favour with authors such as Visser 't Hooft and Brunner, and which dominates the prophetic utterances of George Macleod. Jansen is less favourable to this triad of names in modern systematic theology, and prefers the earlier version of the offices of Christ, High Priest and King. He points out that the threefold formula did not appear in the *Institutes* till the edition of 1539, and is only fully developed in the edition of 1559. For support he appeals to a telling passage in Dr Vincent Taylor's *The Names of Christ*. Yes; certainly a book to tell give to a minister!

Christian Perfection and American Methodism, by John L. Peters (Abingdon Press, via Epworth Bookshop, \$4). This book is a most welcome addition to the growing library of Methodist spirituality. It is an historical study with five successive chapters. The first, covering the years 1724-64, sketches the beginnings of the movement towards holiness in the Religious Societies and in John Wesley's private studies of the lives and writings of the mystics and the saints. His 'ideal of Christian Perfection was almost wholly derived from those writings *plus* the Bible'. As early as 1733 in his sermon before the University at St Mary's, Oxford, he had arrived at certain convictions which governed his thought throughout his life. 'The Christian goal is described as that habitual disposition of soul which, in the sacred writings, is termed holiness', 'the being cleansed from sin, and endued with those virtues which were also in Christ Jesus . . . and so renewed in the spirit of our mind as to be perfect as our Father in Heaven is perfect'. This was his description of it both in 1733 and in 1783. The methods of attaining holiness had to be weighed, and then adopted or dismissed. Second, in the year 1766 there appeared the *Plain Account of Christian Perfection*. It was the result of a revival of interest in the doctrine in Yorkshire in 1759 of which Wesley said: 'Here began that glorious work of sanctification which had been nearly at a standstill for twenty years.' The data seemed to warrant certain firm conclusions, which were put in their final form in the Fourth Edition (1777) of the *Plain Account*.

Third, we have 'The Doctrine Transplanted'. This was no easy task, but in the providence of God another saint and theologian was raised up to succour the Wesleys in their hour of need. John Fletcher had completed his *Checks to Antinomianism* in 1775 and had included as the *Last Check* his treatise on Christian Perfection. This was for a century widely read on both sides of the Atlantic. John Fletcher makes room for another interpretation than that which John Wesley gave to the facts. 'Sanctification', says Fletcher, 'is not generally the work of a day nor of a year. . . . It is in general a progressive work and of long duration.' Through Freeborn Garretson and Francis Asbury and others of like devotion and insight, the doctrine had become part of the preaching message among the American Methodists, and indeed of their discipline, by 1784. Fourth, the most valuable parts of this book to British readers are the last two main chapters, and the Summary and Conclusions, which, with very useful Appendixes, constitute nearly two-thirds of the work. There is a particularly fresh Appendix on John Wesley: The Problem of His testimony to Entire Sanctification. I have learnt a great deal from Dr Peters. His is a book which will give us fresh insight into the spirit and temper of American Methodism. I wish it could be available for students in this country. Take the problem of those quarrels and divisions in the nineteenth century, of which some of us are rather ashamed, both here and in America. If the Arian struggle was defensible, because the issue at stake was the divinity of our Lord, the American separatists, at least in the last six years of the nineteenth century, might shelter under a strong defence. They were holding the doctrine that holiness is necessary for the very being of the Church on earth, as well as for future blessedness. The least that can be said is that holiness is a larger issue than a new organ!

NOTABLE ARTICLES IN PERIODICALS

- The Congregational Quarterly*, July (Independent Press, 4s. 6d.).
 The Free Church Contribution to the Catholic Church, by Kenneth L. Parry.
 D. H. Lawrence and Congregationalism, by A. Whigham Price.
 Johann Gottfried Herder, by Sydney H. Moore.
- The Harvard Theological Review*, July (Oxford University Press).
 The Authorship of Egerton Papyrus No. 3, by Henry Chadwick.
 An Ordinance Against Images in Jerusalem, by Cecil Roth.
- The Hibbert Journal*, July (Allen & Unwin, 4s. 6d.).
 Philosophical Analysis, by Bertrand Russell.
 What do Person Words mean?, by I. T. Ramsey.
 The De-eschatologizing of Christian Doctrine, by S. G. Brandon.
- The International Review of Missions*, July (Oxford University Press, 4s. 6d.).
 Some Present-day Problems for African Christian Marriage, by Ernest Gray.
 The Growth of the Lutheran Church in New Guinea, by George F. Vicedom.
 A Virgin and Child from Medieval China, by John Foster.
- Theology Today*, July (Princeton, N.J., via Blackwell, Oxford, 5s.).
 Tradition and Traditions as an Ecumenical Problem, by J. Robert Nelson.
 A New Day for Protestantism, by Nels F. S. Ferré.
 Jesus and Demon Possession, by John Sutherland Bonnell.
 The Power of Christlike Living, by Bela Vassady.
 Review of Bultmann's *Theology of the New Testament*, by James M. Robinson.
 Review of Wilbert F. Howard's *The Fourth Gospel in Recent Criticism and Interpretation*, by T. S. Liefeld.
- Yale Review*, Summer, 1956 (Yale University Press).
 The Liberty of the Prison: Reflections of a Prisoner of War, by Robert Pach.
 Macbeth: The Anatomy of Loss, by Ian Watt.
 Review of A. Dwight Culler's *The Imperial Intellect; A Study of Newman's Educational Ideal*, by Alvan S. Ryan.
- Studies in Philology*, April 1956 (University of North Carolina Press and Cambridge University Press).
 Britain among the Fortunate Isles, by Joseph Waters Bennett.

in the
esley
ism in
This
makes
Sanc-
It is
etion
come
their
aden
very
ularly
ifica-
fresh
avail-
ne in
nd in
the
ra of
g the
ell as
than

ion,

ad,

ity